

**Digging at Roots and Tugging at Branches:
Christians and 'Race Relations' in the Sixties**

Submitted by Tank Green to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History
in September 2016

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature:

Abstract

This thesis is a study of the 'race relations' work of Christians in the sixties in England, with specific reference to a Methodist church in Notting Hill, London. As such, it is also a study of English racisms: how they were fought against and how they were denied and facilitated. Additionally, the thesis pays attention to the interface of 'religion' and politics and the radical restatement of Christianity in the sixties. Despite a preponderance of sociological literature on 'race relations' and 'religion' in England, there has been a dearth of historical studies of either area in the post-war period. Therefore, this thesis is an important revision to the existing historiography in that it adds flesh to the bones of the story of post-war Christian involvement in the politics of 'race', and gives further texture and detail to the history of racism, 'race relations', and anti-racist struggles in England. Moreover, the thesis implicitly challenges the received wisdom of the decline of the churches in the sixties and shows an active engagement of Christians with politics.

Using a wide range of private and public archives and interviews, the thesis takes a micro-study of the Notting Hill Methodist Church and places it within its wider contexts: how English Christians approached 'race' and 'race relations', what kinds of racialised political engagements existed in Notting Hill, and what kinds of racisms were expressed in England. The contextualised and detailed micro-study has enabled the thesis to capture the texture and depth which is needed to better understand 'race' and 'race relations' in post-war England. In doing so, the thesis sheds detailed light on some active 'civil rights' struggles in England and therefore challenges the received wisdom which views these struggles as being an American rather than an English (or British) story.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	5
List of Abbreviations.....	7
Introduction: Notting Hill, 'Race Relations', and the Myth of Tolerance.....	8
Chapter One: English Christians and 'Race Relations'.....	52
Chapter Two: The Notting Hill Methodist Church – A Church in the World.....	88
Chapter Three: Community Action in Notting Hill.....	127
Chapter Four: Notting Hill Social Council – The Politics and Partnerships of the Church.....	158
Chapter Five: Racism in England – The Postbags of Trevor Huddleston and Archbishop Ramsey.....	209
Chapter Six: The Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre and the World Council of Churches' Consultation on White Racism.....	240
Conclusion.....	300
Bibliography.....	310

Acknowledgements

This thesis couldn't have been written without numerous conversations with several people over five and a half years in Philadelphia, PA, and some warm afternoons sat around the kitchen table of Mrs. Lucille Iffla in Stirling, Scotland. So first and foremost, I want to give thanks to those people for educating and enlightening me in ways I can't really quantify.

Secondly, I must give many thanks to my supervisors: Richard Toye, Gajendra Singh, and Andrew Thompson. Your different perspectives and thoughts on the thesis have helped me immensely as has your enthusiasm and support. A special thank you to Andrew and Richard who were extremely patient with all of the twists and turns the thesis took in the first year. I am also very grateful to the Arts and Humanities Research Council for the financial support which made this research project possible.

I must also extend a sincere and massive debt of gratitude to Notting Hill Methodist Church for being such an interesting place in the world. In particular, the generosity of time and insight given to me by Revd David Mason, Stephen Duckworth, and Brian Frost was invaluable. I hope that your generosity with me has resulted in a history which you recognise as truthful and faithful to your lives. Additionally, I must also deeply thank Revd. Eric Mustapha for granting me access to the church's attic; without that access, this thesis would have been a much poorer offering. Similarly, I would also like to thank the Kensington and Chelsea Social Council for the afternoon spent rummaging through their files. Thanks also to Jenny Bourne and Sivanandan for granting me an interview containing a vital spark.

I am also grateful to the many archivists who have helped me navigate their holdings over the last three years. Thanks especially to the incredible kindness, trust, tea, and chocolate of Hans von Rütte and Anne-Emmanuelle Tankam at the World Council of Churches Archives. Thanks also to everyone at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Archives, the Cadbury Research Library Archives in Birmingham, Lambeth Palace Archives, Church of England Record Centre (special thanks to Simon Sheppard), and the technician at the BFI for his tea, biscuits, and banter.

A deep debt of gratitude is owed to Kiri Kankhwende who gave me thoughtful, measured, considered, helpful, encouraging, and insightful feedback on the thesis. Finally, I want to give eternal thanks to e bond, whose friendship sustains me despite the oceans and years between us.

List of Abbreviations

BCC – British Council of Churches

CARD – Campaign Against Racial Discrimination

CRC – Community Relations Commission

CRRU – Community and Race Relations Unit

EHPP – East Harlem Protestant Parish

GLC – Greater London Council

LCC – London County Council

NCCI – National Council for Commonwealth Immigrants

NHMC – Notting Hill Methodist Church

NHSC – Notting Hill Social Council

PCR – Programme to Combat Racism

PEP – Political and Economic Planning (Report)

SCM – Student Christian Movement

WCC – World Council of Churches

Introduction: Notting Hill, 'Race Relations', and the Myth of Tolerance

In 1958, the English designer Gerald Holtom invented the 'peace symbol' which was later to become the logo for CND; that same year saw major episodes of racialised violence by white people in Nottingham and Notting Hill, England.¹ These two issues – nuclear war and 'race' – represent two of the enduring concerns of Christians during the sixties, but whilst the relationships between Christianity and the peace movement are well known, the involvement of English Christians with 'race relations' is less known.² So we begin then in 1958, a year when an enduring symbol of peace was created, and a year which has become iconic in the history of English 'race relations' for the violence and antipathy it represents.³ Before the so-called 'riots', it is said that white English people tried to ignore 'race' and hoped that the non-European migrants would return from whence they came.⁴ There was at that juncture, no marked public 'race relations' discourse, although the white violence would change that, albeit only in some senses and only in some ways.⁵

- 1 The site of the London violence would more accurately be called Notting Dale. However, that name fell out of usage at about the same time as the violence, so the names Notting Hill or North Kensington will be used throughout the thesis. A third name for the locale was also used by black residents: The Grove. Mike Phillips and Trevor Phillips, *Windrush: The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain* (London: HarperCollins, 1998), p. 106. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 8 December 1967, pp. 18, 43.
- 2 Although there has been some focus on the Church of England in this area. See: Matthew Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism, 1962-2012,' in *Rescripting Religion in the City: Migration and Religious Identity in the Modern Metropolis*, ed. by Jane Garnett and Alana Harris (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 207–221. Edson Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism: The Church of England's Response to Afro-Caribbean Migration, 1948-1981' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the West of England, 2004). See also Rob Skinner's work for Christian involvement in anti-apartheid campaigning: *The Foundations of Anti-Apartheid: Liberal Humanitarians and Transnational Activists in Britain and the United States, c.1919-64* (Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- 3 Christian involvement in 'race relations' work is mainly unknown throughout all the constituent parts of the UK. However, this thesis has chosen to focus specifically on England, and even more specifically on London, as it received the most non-white migrants in the period surveyed. The author has deliberately chosen to not use Britain as a synonym for England in recognition of the different histories and patterns of migration to, and expressions of racism in, Scotland and Wales. However, this is not in any way to suggest that Scotland and Wales do not have these histories to uncover and discuss. When Britain / British is used, it is because the material under discussion used Britain over England. 'Race relations' as a term is problematised because it both assumes and constructs that idea there are 'races' between which relations can be formed. See below for more on that.
- 4 Although widely called the 'Notting Hill riots', this is a misnomer as it de-emphasises the specific racialised aspects of the violence as practised by white people against black people. For other rejections of the term see: Robert Winder, *Bloody Foreigners: The Story of Immigration to Britain* (London: Abacus, 2004, repr. 2008), pp. 362–370. Michael Rowe, *The Racialisation of Disorder in Twentieth Century Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 105–106.
- 5 Ken Kolsbun with Mike Sweeney, *Peace: The Biography of a Symbol* (Enfield: National

The atmosphere of which the white violence was a manifestation also resulted in the still unsolved murder of Kelso Cochrane on 17 May 1959; a murder which is considered to have put anti-racism on the national agenda and is still considered so controversial that the police files are sealed until 2041.⁶ In this way, it becomes easy to see how, for the eminent cultural theorist Stuart Hall, the white violence of the late 1950s was a marker representing the beginning of an explosive combination of 'race' and politics in England. A marker which represented the emergence of a specifically British form of racism.⁷ For others, the white violence represented the end of an era: the shattering of innocence and the end of Caribbean people's confidence in England as the 'mother country', and their realisation of the fragility of their status as citizens within it.⁸ For Sivanandan, the white violence ended the '*laissez faire*' era of immigration leading to both immigration controls and the official management of racism.⁹ Therefore, the Anglican priest Kenneth Leech was right to say that the white violence of 1958 'is remembered as the first clear evidence of "Britain's race problem"'.¹⁰ It is also clear that the decade which followed these symbolic events was crucial in the history of responses to black migration to England.¹¹

Geographic, 2008). E.J.B. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 206. Steven Fielding, 'Brotherhood and the Brothers: Responses to "coloured" Immigration in the British Labour Party C. 1951–1965,' *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 3 (1998), 79–97 (p. 88). For literature on Christians and the peace movement see: Richard Taylor, *Against the Bomb: The British Peace Movement, 1958-1965* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); and Marc Reuver, *Christians as Peace Makers: Peace Movements in Europe and the USA* (Geneva: WCC Publications 1988).

6 The author put in a FOI request to view the files on the murder of Kelso Cochrane, but this was rejected as it was claimed that it failed the public interest test. The author appealed against the decision, but unfortunately lost the appeal. For information on the murder see: Mark Olden, *Murder in Notting Hill* (Alresford: Zero Books, 2011). Ruth Glass, *Newcomers: The West Indians in London* (London: Centre for Urban Studies and George Allen & Unwin, 1960), pp. 164–168. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 182–188.

7 Stuart Hall, 'Racism and Reaction', in *Five Views of Multi-Racial Britain: talks on race relations broadcast by BBC TV* (London: Commission for Racial Equality, 1978), pp. 23–35 (p. 27). Stuart Hall as cited by Mugiko Nishikawa, *Grassroots Media Zine, No. 2* (Urbana, IL: Champaign, 2014), p. 28.

8 Edward Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country: West Indians and the Notting Hill White Riots* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1988), pp. 8, 139–141. Dilip Hiro, *Black British, White British: A History of Race Relations* (London: Grafton, 1971, repr. 1991), p. 40. Ambalavaner Sivanandan and Jenny Bourne, Interviewed by the author, 16 May 2014. Trevor Carter with Jean Coussins, *Shattering Illusions: West Indians in British Politics* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1986), p. 66.

9 Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Race, Class and the State: The Black Experience in Britain', in *A Different Hunger: Writings on Black Resistance*, by Ambalavaner Sivanandan (London: Pluto Press, 1982), pp. 101–126 (pp. 101–108).

10 Kenneth Leech, *Struggle in Babylon: Racism in the Cities and Churches of Britain* (London: Sheldon, 1988), p. 64.

11 Colin Holmes, *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871-1971* (Basingstoke:

So the racialised violence of 1958 was then a *marker*, but it cannot be called a *rupture*. Despite it serving as the entry-point of this thesis, it is important to underscore that the violence did *not* emerge out of nowhere: it had a history and one must pay some attention to the opinions, discourses, and acts which swept the moment into time. For whilst this is not a history of the 'riots' themselves – that has been told elsewhere – it is important to understand something of the context from which this narrative begins.¹² Firstly, one should note that not only were there sporadic outbreaks of racialised violence by white people all throughout the summer immediately preceding the so-called 'riots', but there was also an historic precedent for violence against people racialised as other-than-white in terms of the 1919 riots, and many other outbreaks of violence throughout the first half of the twentieth century.¹³ Indeed, historians of 'immigration' to Britain have tended to draw out both the normalcy of 'immigration' *and* the continual hostility displayed by white British people towards migrants over the centuries.¹⁴ Just as Gunnar Myrdal articulated the tensions between American notions of freedom and inalienable rights *vis-à-vis* actual American policies of discrimination and segregation, we can find in the English experience a gap between what was preached – 'British values' – and

Macmillan, 1988, repr. 1994), p. 260. Jodi Burkett, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain: Britishness, 'Race' and the Radical Left in the 1960s* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 134.

- 12 For more on the white violence see: Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country*. Glass, *Newcomers*, pp. 127–146. Peter Fryer, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (London: Pluto, 1984), pp. 376–381. Michael Abdul Malik, *From Michael de Freitas to Michael X* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1968), pp. 73–93. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 158–180. Colin MacInnes' novel *Absolute Beginners* also contains an account of the disturbances in the final chapter. See: *The Colin MacInnes Omnibus: His Three London Novels* (London: Allen & Busby, 1985), pp. 167–203.
- 13 Ruth Glass notes racialised violence in 1943, 1948, 1949 and 1954. Glass, *Newcomers*, pp. 127–136. James Wickenden, *Colour in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1958), pp. 39–40. Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country*, pp. 103–105. Glass, *Newcomers*, p. 136. Tom Vague, *London Psychogeography: Rachman Riots and Rillington Place* (London: Vague, 1988), p. 25. Jacqueline Jenkinson, *Black 1919: Riots, Racism and Resistance in Imperial Britain* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009). Hakim Adi, *West Africans in Britain 1900-1960: Nationalism, Pan-Africanism and Communism* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1998), pp. 158–160. D.W. Dean, 'Coping with Colonial Immigration, the Cold War and Colonial Policy: The Labour Government and Black Communities in Great Britain 1945-51,' *Immigrants & Minorities*, 6 (1987), 305–334 (p.323).
- 14 See, for instance: Tony Kushner, *The Battle of Britishness: Migrant Journeys, 1685 to the Present* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012). Holmes, *John Bull's Island*. Colin Holmes, *A Tolerant Country? Immigrants, Refugees and Minorities in Britain* (London: Faber & Faber, 1991). James Walvin, *Passage to Britain: Immigration in British History and Politics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984). Rozina Visram, *Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History* (London: Pluto, 2002). Fryer, *Staying Power*. The author has chosen to problematise 'immigration' for reasons outlined below.

the actual fact of values as practised. As such, the white violence and the murder of Kelso Cochrane are markers which both disrupt and undermine narratives of 'British values', but which also reveal the truth of values as practised.¹⁵

Depictions of Notting Hill in the 1950s and 1960s tend towards cosmopolitan, lively, unruly, and permissive accounts such as in the literature of Colin MacInnes, or in the words (and pictures) of Mike and Charlie Phillips, and Michael Abdul Malik's autobiography; and depictions of a trouble-prone, impoverished, and rundown slum.¹⁶ These depictions are perhaps not mutually exclusive: North Kensington *was* an impoverished area with appalling living conditions, that much is agreed upon by everyone. However, since in one set of accounts one gets a sense of roguish vibrancy, and in the other a sense of a grey, squalid, and desperate degeneracy, it would also seem that some people were able to see its redeeming features. Either way, all of the accounts agree that at the time of the white violence, the Notting Hill area was suffering a severe housing crisis, had high crime levels, rising unemployment, and significant fascist activity in the form of Mosley's Union Movement, Colin Jordan's White Defence League, and the KKK.¹⁷ In many ways, there is a sense

15 Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (London: Harper, 1944). Sivanandan and Bourne, Interviewed by the author. This point has also been made by the following historians: Hiro, *Black British*, p. 10, and Kushner generally in his, *The Battle of Britishness*.

16 Charlie Phillips and Mike Phillips, *Notting Hill in the Sixties* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1991). Vague, *London Psychogeography*, pp. 19–20. Malik, *From Michael de Freitas*. Pearl Jephcott, *A Troubled Area: Notes on Notting Hill* (London: Faber & Faber, 1964). Wickenden, *Colour in Britain*. MacInnes, *The Colin MacInnes Omnibus*. Whilst MacInnes wrote fiction, his work is considered to be factual social documentary by Stuart Hall, Mike and Charlie Phillips, and the Revd David Mason. On this see: Stuart Hall, 'Absolute Beginnings: Reflections on the Secondary Modern Generation', *Universities and Left Review*, 7 (1959), 17–25. Phillips and Phillips, *Notting Hill in the Sixties*, p. 73. Kensington and Chelsea Social Council Archives (KCSC), David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986. MacInnes' work was also included in the reading list for Associates of the Notting Hill Methodist Church. Notting Hill Methodist Church Archives (NHMC), Book List for the Convenience of Associates, n.d. c. 1963.

17 Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Archives (RBKC), The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1959, Vol. LIX, Inter-Racial Problems, 8 December 1959, pp. 413–414. The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of the General Purposes Committee, 1958–1960, Family Welfare Association, Kensington Citizens Advice Bureau: Report by Mrs Jeffrey, West Indian Social Worker, for the year ending 30 October 1960. Jephcott, *A Troubled Area*, pp. 18–19, 38–66, 131–133. Glass, *Newcomers*, pp. 171–192. Wickenden, *Colour in Britain*, pp. 9–18, 21, 36–37. Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country*, pp. 41–52, 89, 98–100. Rowe, *The Racialisation of Disorder*, pp. 112–117. Malik, *From Michael de Freitas*, pp. 55–115. Phillips and Phillips, *Notting Hill in the Sixties*, pp. 50–51. Olden, *Murder in Notting Hill*, p. 158, n. 20, but the book in general paints a portrait of a high crime area. Marika Sherwood, *Claudia Jones: A Life in*

of a forgotten place, a place left to rot and ferment softly by itself, which Mike and Charlie Phillips suggest was because Notting Hill lacked an acceptable narrative for its poverty as it had escaped bombing during the war. It was poor because it was; there was nothing to pity.¹⁸

When seeking to 'explain' the white violence, mainstream press accounts both referred to the events in racialised terms – as 'race riots' or 'racial violence' – and simultaneously downplayed any racist motive to the crimes, whilst *at the same time* reporting on clearly racist acts.¹⁹ In this way, the reports make for confusing reading. For instance, a *The Times* article stated that the cause of the disturbances was not racism or hooliganism, but then went on to racialise every subject of the article, including the white inhabitants as drunk Irish and lawless gypsies. Whilst listing a string of racist incidents committed by these white people, the article simultaneously attempted to undermine the acts by countering them with examples of displays of lack of racism by whites, as if one person's lack of racism renders irrelevant the racism of others. Furthermore, using the examples given in the articles, one fails to see how a white man shaking a black man's hand is a gesture forceful enough to counter statements like, 'We think all niggers should be shot'. Likewise, a *Daily Mail* article proclaimed that the reason a white man slashed and screamed at black men with a razor was because he was anxious over the insecurity that 'immigration' had produced. What these two articles show is the clear disjuncture in understandings of racism at this time: the violence was simultaneously about 'race' but yet not indicative of racism.²⁰

Writing in 1960, Ruth Glass noted that there was a polarisation of opinion on how to fix 'the problem' which was never named as racism. It was either a social

Exile (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1999), p. 129. David Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill: The Formation of a Group Ministry* (London: The Epworth Press, 1967), p. 7. The Union Movement was agitating against a black presence in Britain from at least 1957 through their *Action* newspaper. Donald Chesworth, a Labour member of the London County Council (LCC) for North Kensington, had a team of volunteers attend Mosley's meetings around North Kensington in 1959 and meticulously record what was said. See various files in: Donald Chesworth Archives (DCA), PP2/46.

18 Phillips and Phillips, *Notting Hill in the Sixties*, p. 25. This point is also made by: Shaaron Whetlor, *The Story of Notting Dale: From Potteries & Piggeries to Present Times* (London: Kensington and Chelsea Community History Group, 1998), p. 66.

19 The *West Indian Gazette*, however, reported consistently on racism in Britain in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

20 Our Special Correspondent, 'London Racial Outburst Due To Many Factors', *The Times*, 3 September 1958, p. 7. Maurice Edelman, MP, 'Should we let them keep pouring in?', *Daily Mail*, 2 September 1958, p. 4.

problem involving housing, education, and legislation; or a 'colour problem' involving 'undesirable coloured people' which required both deportations and immigration restrictions, and which, in turn, gave rise to quality/quantity debates. Likewise, Stuart Hall noted that the white violence was variously rooted in fascist agitation by Mosley's Union Movement and Colin Jordan's White Defence League; white teenagers ('teddy boys') and hooliganism; and 'structural antagonism' between whites and blacks in the Borough. Revd David Mason of the Notting Hill Methodist Church saw four elements combining to create the events: bad housing, fascist activity, racism, and the failure of the local community in adjusting, practically and emotionally, to living alongside the newly arrived migrants. What these commentators were illustrating was that, by blaming the 'teddy boys' and/or 'the immigrants', responsibility of the adult whites, and the social malaise of the area, was not called into question. Similarly, Revd Kenneth Leech surmised that constructing the problem along the lines of 'hooliganism' or fascism made it seem like racism was a fringe phenomenon and not part of society at large. This meant that racism came to be seen to be a consequence of the black presence, and not something innate to white society.²¹

Given the prominence placed on the 'riots' of Notting Hill by the press, it is surprising how little information can be found on them in the archives. Indeed, it would be hard to construct much of a narrative of the violence at all on the basis of local or church and voluntary society archives.²² In respect of the Church of England, Kenneth Leech notes how it played no role in respect of social issues of 'race' or housing in Notting Hill at that time as it was too preoccupied with its own internal affairs, and did not take racism seriously until the late 1960s. Likewise, Edson Burton considers the Church of England complacent on issues of 'race' and racism at the time of the 'riots'. Although this would seem to be the default position for much of England, Christian and otherwise, it should also be noted that the British Council of Churches issued a condemnation of the

21 Glass, *Newcomers*, p. 151. Hall, 'Racism and Reaction', pp. 27–28. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 7–8. Leech, *Struggle in Babylon*, pp. 65–67. See also: Clive Webb, 'Brotherhood, Betrayal, and Rivers of Blood: Southern Segregationists and British Race Relations', in *The Other Special Relationship: Race, Rights, and Riots in Britain and the United States*, ed. by Robin D.G. Kelley and Stephen Tuck (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 225–241 (pp. 232–233).

22 This includes the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea's archives which contain practically nothing on the white violence of 1958.

violence and stood opposed to immigration restrictions in the grounds of colour.²³

This is not to say that individual white Anglicans did not take a stand. For instance, writing in *The Times*, Trevor Huddleston was of the opinion that, should the violence lead to restrictive legislation, then this would be evidence of Britain's racism; but should it lead to 'a radical searching of the conscience on the part of ordinary citizens and to a determination that the evil of colour-discrimination be totally eradicated from our national life, then much good with have come out of evil'.²⁴ Likewise, the Bishop of Chester, Dr G. A. Ellison, thought that the violence could be a blessing in disguise if used to ask what was wrong with society, and if it led (white) people to wake up to the fact that racial discrimination should not be tolerated. Christians, he asserted, had a special duty and needed to translate into action what had often been preached in terms of God seeing no boundaries between 'races'.²⁵

Institutionally speaking, the Quakers were slightly more proactive than the Church of England and issued a public statement expressing concern over the violence and emphasising that racial discrimination was contrary to Christian teaching. Furthermore, they discussed plans of action internally, and stressed the importance of personal steps towards reconciliation. In addition, they hosted a meeting at Friends' House on 6 September 1958 with Norman Manley, David Pitt, and George Rogers (Labour MP for North Kensington), amongst others, speaking to an audience of 1200, which was comprised mainly of black people. This meeting serves well to underscore the generalised narratives which were erected at the time and which were to continue throughout the decade: the black speakers (Manley and Pitt) sourced the cause of the riots in colour, 'race', and racism and internationalised the event, whereas Rogers' analysis involved the criminalisation of the black populace and statements on the alleged

23 Leech, *Struggle in Babylon*, pp. 52–54. Kenneth Leech, 'The Church and Immigration and Race Relations Policy', in *Church and Politics Today: Essays on the Role of the Church of England in Contemporary Politics*, ed. by George Moyser (Edinburgh: T&T Clarke, 1985), pp. 201–220 (p. 201). Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 227–230. Stephen Deakin, 'The churches: immigration and race relations', *New Community*, 12 (1984–85), 101–115 (p. 102).

24 Trevor Huddleston, 'Race-Riots In Nottingham,' *The Times*, 30 August 1958, p. 7.

25 'Challenge of Race Riots: "Salutary jolt" to our pride,' *Manchester Guardian*, 24 September 1958, p. 4. 'Racial Riots Condemned: "Vicious Cancer in Our Midst," say Bishop of Chester', *Church Times*, 26 September 1958, p. 1.

marginalisation of his white constituents.²⁶

This bifurcated narrative was also evidenced in a discussion between Revd Dr Marcus James, a black Anglican vicar, and George Rogers on a Gaumont British News show aired 8 September 1958. In this programme, Rogers read the situation as occurring because of poor housing and black crime, and posed the 'solution' of restricting the settlement of black people in overcrowded areas and of giving the police greater powers to deal with black people found to be committing crime. In contrast, Revd James refuted Rogers' points by de-racialising crime and by locating housing as only part of the problem. James went on to agree that law and order should be maintained, but made it quite clear that the subjects of increased policing should be those who incited racial violence.²⁷

What these examples show is the profoundly different ways in which the events of 1958 were analysed by different sectors of society at that time. On the one hand, black politicians, black Christians, black social workers, and progressive white Christians sought to attribute the violence to white racism.²⁸ Whereas in contrast, the (white dominated) press, white politicians, and others sought to locate it anywhere but there whilst at the same time acknowledging the racialised content of the violence.²⁹ Without wishing to homogenise the nuances

26 Religious Society of Friends Archives (RSF), RRC/M5, Race Relations Committee Minutes 4 May 1955 – 5 December 1958, 'Statement from Race Relations Committee of the Religious Society of Friends', n.d. c. September 1958, Minutes, 3 September 1958. Race Relations Committee Minutes 4 May 1955 – 5 December 1958, Minutes, 1 October 1958. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 376, 390–391. Our London Staff, 'Solving the problems of race and colour: Jamaican Minister's Appeal', *Manchester Guardian*, 8 September 1958, p. 1. 'Colour crisis: battles only of words. Committees seek solution', *Kensington Post*, 12 September 1958, p. 1. Marking white people as oppressed minority is a discursive tactic designed to deflect attention away from white privilege and domination. Steve Garner, *Whiteness: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 39.

27 'Southport: Rose of England – Colour Bar Violence', *Gaumont British News*, 8 September 1958, <<http://jiscmediahub.ac.uk/record/display/030-00038710>> [accessed 16 August 2016].

28 'Riots "Primarily a Racial Issue": Mr Manley's opinion', *Manchester Guardian*, 18 September 1958, p. 2. In this article, Manley referred to social conditions as the trigger mechanism firing the gun of racism. 'Southport: Rose of England', *Gaumont British News*, 8 September 1958, <<http://jiscmediahub.ac.uk/record/display/030-00038710>> [accessed 16 August 2016]. 'Night Patrol Notting Hill', *ITV News*, 2 September 1958, <<http://jiscmediahub.ac.uk/record/display/039-00042583>> [accessed 16 August 2016]. This news clip has a black social worker, Mr Pilgrim, stating that the Notting Hill district had been subjected to an organised campaign of racial hatred.

29 As well as the George Rogers comments cited above, Hansard shows that racism as a cause was downplayed in the November debate on the subject. The debate located it in fringe fascist elements whilst at the same time acknowledging the extent of discrimination in employment, housing, and the generally held racist prejudices on the part of white people.

in either group, the confusion in the narrative of the latter group – the non-racist racialised nature of the violence – is another example of the disjuncture referred to by Sivanandan above. It is a refusal to see the truth of their own speech. The point has been drawn out in this manner so as to situate the discussion which follows in the wider context in which it exists.

'Race Relations' and the Myth of Tolerance

To remind the reader, two tendencies have been highlighted above. The first was black and progressive white speech as being rooted in internationalism and as focusing on white racism or 'racialism'; the second was majority white speech which blamed black people for perceived ills or otherwise generally refused to meet white racism head on. These dual tendencies form part of a thread which is to run throughout this thesis. Another aspect of this thread lies in the lack of ability of the black and progressive white speech to make solid hits home due to their audience refusing to recognise their target: racism. With this statement, the field of 'race relations' is being alluded to. As a field, 'race relations' constrained and contained all speech on 'race' and racism during the sixties. Therefore at this juncture, the relationship between racism and 'race relations' will be remarked upon further. Simply put, the field of 'race relations' is predicated on the existence of racism, yet this phenomenon was rarely explicitly addressed in the sixties.

To state clearly then: any study of 'race relations', or studies of those engaged in that work, is implicitly a study of racism. Whether or not it is named, 'race relations' discourses, practitioners, and the concept or field generally, would not have arisen without the prior existence of racism. It is racism which animates the field and gives it life, racism which sets the agenda and terms of debate, and racism which makes it inevitable, intractable, and confused. It is confused because, invariably, racism is not named as the causal factor of study, and so effects and symptoms of racism are addressed instead. Indeed, when working through texts produced in the sixties on 'race relations', it is difficult not to fall into the terms of the debate as were set, thereby replicating structures which

These debates also deployed individual instances of allegedly positive behaviour towards black people to undermine any possibility of racism from other white members of society. See, *Hansard*, HL Deb 19 November 1958, Vol 212, Cols 632–724.

have proved inadequate to say the least.³⁰ This thesis then, whilst examining the field of 'race relations' as then constructed, will attempt to sustain an analysis which sees through the field and names the motivating forces of racism which operated through it.

Racism in England is important to study because racism is often assumed to be 'out there', elsewhere, outwith the nation's borders. For instance, at the time the thesis is concerned with, there was much concern over South African apartheid and the civil rights movement in the USA, and sometimes events in England were compared to events in the USA, such as Little Rock, Arkansas.³¹ These occurrences elsewhere were often easily condemned by whites in England whilst simultaneously denying any equivalence with events at home. In the present day, popular media and journalism will often make reference to the civil rights movement in the USA, but one rarely hears reference made to anti-racist struggles undertaken in England or Britain in the sixties and seventies. This has led Stephen Tuck to remark that British popular memory sees the history of civil rights as being an American and not a British story. Tuck notes how a statue of Martin Luther King, Jr. was erected at Westminster Abbey, unlike any black British activist.³² As such, alongside Tuck's *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, this thesis is attempting to fill in the gaps in public memory in respect of English racisms and fights against them.

In her powerful text *A Portrait of English Racism*, Ann Dummett noted that the generally accepted existence of 'race relations' made 'race relations' impossible to see clearly and therefore impossible to evaluate.³³ She wrote that the term assumes that there are 'races' of people with specific and separate relationships between them which are necessary and deserving of study. However, she went on to state that in England, the problem of relationships between people who

30 See the following for an excellent analysis of the early sociological literature: Chris Waters, "'Dark Strangers' in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963," *Journal of British Studies*, 36 (1997), 207-238.

31 See, for instance: Trevor Huddleston, "Bigger Than Little Rock": Problems of Race that Concern the Whole World', *Church Times*, 21 November 1958, p. 6. "Lynch him!" cries as coloured man is chased', *Manchester Guardian*, 2 September 1958, p. 1.

32 Stephen Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press), pp. 180-187, 200.

33 Ann Dummett was an important Catholic anti-racist campaigner working as a Liaison Officer / Community Relations Officer in Oxford for several years. She was also one of the founders of the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, and the director of Runnymede Trust from 1984-1987.

are English and those deemed not to be, was in actual fact a problem of English attitudes and actions.³⁴ Furthermore, this distinction was made by way of racism which she considered little understood. To this end, Dummett found that many English people denied the existence of racism since they could not bear the idea of its proximity. She said that English people preferred instead to adhere to a belief that racism occurred elsewhere, at a distance – thus failing to see their own.³⁵ This tension over proximity and distance is mirrored, as shall be shown in Chapter Five, in allegations over liberal dependence on distance to make positive statements about 'immigration', and the relationship of hostility to proximity.

Ann Dummett further noted that ignoring racism – despite all of the emphasis on 'race relations' – was a sure way to guarantee that injustice and unhappiness would increase. She noted that by 1970, not only had racist practises increased since Justice Salmon's 1958 proclamation, but so too had the willingness to accept them.³⁶ This point of view was echoed by the eminent black activist and educationalist Gus John in a 1976 British Council of Churches (BCC) publication *The New Black Presence in Britain*, wherein he stated that Britain had refused to come to terms with its own history and was essentially a racist society.³⁷ The findings of the 1966-7 Political and Economic Planning (PEP) report commissioned by the National Council for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI) which furnished solid evidence of the existence of widespread racist practises in housing and employment, the rise of violence against South Asians in the East End of London and Southall in the 1970s, police harassment, and educational stigmatisation, all attested to the rising levels of racism in England,

34 It is clear that Dummett understood English as a racialised identity or ethnicity as opposed to a non-racialised nationality.

35 Ann Dummett, *A Portrait of English Racism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), pp. 9–11. Similarly, in 1967 Dipak Nandy noted a tendency to shy away from discussions of discrimination in favour of welfare or individualised problems. As cited by Michael J. Hill and Ruth M. Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations: A Study of Community Relations Committees in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1971), p. 29.

36 Speaking during the sentencing of some of the youths involved in the white violence in Notting Hill, Justice Salmon said, 'Everyone, irrespective of the colour of their skin, is entitled to walk through our streets in peace, with their heads erect, and free from fear. *This is a right which these courts will always unfailingly uphold*'. 'Four-Year Terms For Nine "Nigger-Hunting" Youths', *The Times*, 16 September 1958, p. 4, *emphasis mine*. Dummett, *A Portrait of English Racism*, pp. 10–12.

37 Gus John, 'The Black Experience of Britain', in British Council of Churches, *The New Black Presence in Britain: A Christian Scrutiny* (London: Community and Race Relations Unit of the British Council of Churches, 1976), pp. 11–17 (p. 12).

and have led contemporary theorists to call the effects of white racism on black people 'white terror'.³⁸

The essence of Dummett's book was an attempt to disrupt the myth of English tolerance.³⁹ Earlier, and in the same vein, Dummett, with her husband the philosopher Michael Dummett, asserted that the vast majority of English people were racist.⁴⁰ They advanced the notion of the 'crypto-racist', by which they meant people who were both deeply racist and, at the same time, deeply ashamed of being so. They asserted that the element of shame was precisely the thing which prohibited people from seeing their own racism, being as it was, the very thing which they could not face about themselves. The Dummetts were of the view that the vast majority of English people were unable to tolerate the idea of a truly equal society, and were consequentially incapable of treating black people equally.⁴¹ However, at the same time, the Dummetts determined that the English public viewed racial prejudice as a shameful thing, which did not marry with the public's idea of themselves as 'liberal and fundamentally egalitarian'. Therefore, for a 'crypto-racist', an equal multi-racial society was

38 W.W. Daniel, *Racial Discrimination in England: Based on the PEP Report* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968). The journal *Race Today* devoted an entire issue to violence against South Asians: *Race Today*, 8 (1976). See also: Anandi Ramamurthy, *Black Star: Britain's Asian Youth Movements* (London: Pluto, 2013). Anandi Ramamurthy, 'The Politics of Britain's Asian Youth Movements', *Race & Class*, 48 (2006), 38–60. For a State form of gendered violence against South Asian women see, Evan Smith and Marinella Marmo, 'Uncovering the "Virginity Testing" Controversy in the National Archives: The Intersectionality of Discrimination in British Immigration History', *Gender & History*, 23 (2011), 147–165. For police violence see, for instance: All Faiths For One Race, *Talking Blues: The Black Community Speaks About Its Relationship with the Police* (Birmingham: AFFOR, 1978). Stuart Hall, et. al., *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, The State, and Law and Order* (London: Macmillan, 1978). For educational stigmatisation see: Marina Maxwell, 'Violence in the Toilets: The Experiences of a Black Teacher in Brent Schools', *Race Today*, 1 (1969), 136–139. Claudia Jones, 'The Caribbean Community in Britain', *Freedomways*, 4 (1964), 341–357 (p. 352). Bernard Coard, *How the West Indian child is made educationally subnormal in the British school system: the scandal of the black child in schools in Britain* (London: New Beacon, 1971). Paul Warmington, *Black British intellectuals and education: multiculturalism's hidden history* (London: Routledge, 2014). Kehinde Andrews, *Resisting racism: race, inequality and the Black supplementary school movement* (London: Institute of Education Press, 2013). Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'From Resistance to Rebellion: Asian and Afro-Caribbean Struggles in Britain', in *A Different Hunger*, by Sivanandan, pp. 3–54 (p. 30). For 'white terror' see: bell hooks, *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1992), pp. 165–178. Garner, *Whiteness*, pp. 13–33.

39 Elsewhere historians such as Tony Kushner and Colin Holmes have also attempted to problematise this myth. See, for instance: Kushner, *The Battle of Britishness*. Holmes, *A Tolerant Country?*

40 An opinion shared by Canon Collins who asserted that, 'The majority of the natives of Britain are racist without knowing it; many of them haven't a clue how racist they really are'. As cited in, 'Pulpit call for sympathy to Black Power', *The Times*, 31 March 1969, p. 3.

41 Hence the shameful treatment and eventual murder of David Oluwale. See: Kester Aspden, *Nationality: Wog. The Hounding of David Oluwale* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007).

as intolerable as a segregationist one.⁴² Similarly, Robin DiAngelo has said that,

white moral objection to racism increases white resistance to acknowledging complicity with it. In a white supremacist context, white identity in large part rests upon a foundation of (superficial) racial toleration and acceptance. Whites who position themselves as liberal often opt to protect what they perceive as their moral reputation, rather than recognize or change their participation in systems of inequity and domination.⁴³

Whether or not it can truthfully be said that the majority of the white English people of the sixties felt shame for their racist words and behaviour as the Dummetts suggest, the research undertaken for this thesis certainly supports the idea that they did not recognise themselves as racist in any significant or meaningful way.

One could argue that such an emphasis on racism as widespread in England is counterproductive, that it diffuses it, normalises it, and makes it commonplace. There are also arguments which state that there is racism which discriminates and racism which kills, and that the latter is the most important to counter.⁴⁴ However, what should be considered is that a belief in one's essential goodness (or that of the nation) can hinder self-reflection; in this way, one misses one's own complicity with racist structures and one's own perpetuation of racist thoughts and practises. Furthermore, it is individuals which operate State and institutional structures, individuals who discriminate, individuals who kill, and individuals who do not mobilise *en masse* against the more extreme and violent forms of racism, beyond, that is, verbal consternations and condemnations, none of which have accomplished much.⁴⁵ Therefore, it is considered important to uncover the racisms articulated by English people in order to acknowledge them as a part of the nation's history. For until racism is acknowledged as a fact of English history and culture, it cannot be actively fought. In other words, anti-

42 Michael and Ann Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', in *Justice First*, ed. by Lewis Donnelly (London: Sheed and Ward, 1969), pp. 25–78 (pp. 31–32).

43 Robin DiAngelo, 'White Fragility', *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3 (2011), 54–70 (p. 64).

44 This is another way of making a distinction between individual and institutional racism. Avery F. Gordon, 'On "Lived Theory": An Interview with A. Sivanandan', *Race & Class*, 55 (2014), 1–7 (p. 3).

45 Sara Ahmed also cautions that an over-emphasis on institutional racism may lead to a failure to see the individuals acting within the institution. Sara Ahmed, 'Declarations of Whiteness', *borderlands ejournal*, 3 (2004) <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/ahmed_declarations.htm>, [accessed 16 August 2016].

racist activism needs a *widely acknowledged* target in order to have a chance of being effective.

What the Dummetts were highlighting was the element of denial in English people's understandings of their own racism.⁴⁶ This denial spanned all sectors of society from politicians, to academics, to the clergy, and the general public. One of the main ways this denial showed itself was through a construction of an allegedly 'essentially tolerant nature' of the wider white English public. This myth was constructed publicly in the media and also through texts written by white 'race relations' professionals, and it advanced a narrative which, as we saw above, tended to run counter to that of black people at that time. Unsurprisingly, it was this narrative of tolerance and fair play which found most purchase in the public narratives of England (and Britain more generally), despite the findings of the PEP report which uncovered widespread racism of levels higher even than that which was reported by black people.⁴⁷ In essence, the construction of the myth of tolerance was the construction of a *public* discourse, a story the nation told about itself to all those willing to listen. As shall be shown throughout this thesis, the denials of racism which were publicly made through the construction of the myth, run in stark opposition to the expressions of racism encountered repeatedly by those who worked for better 'race relations'.

This construction of the myth of tolerance has traditionally been coupled with the construction of the figure of 'The Racist'. As Sara Ahmed explains, 'The Racist' is the far-right figure who is rejected outright both as a reflection of self and also as a member of normal society: 'The Racist' is not 'us'. In this way, 'The Racist' as a symbolic figure is another mechanism which allows for a sidestepping of engagement with assertions of an individual's racism, thereby leaving structures, practises, and beliefs intact. Moreover, 'The Racist' can be seen as a purifying figure, a repository for the nation's acts of discrimination. By acting in this way as a receptacle, 'The Racist' cleanses the nation of

46 See also: Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, pp. 82, 88.

47 Holmes, *A Tolerant Country?*. Rose, et. al., *Colour and Citizenship*. World Council of Churches Secretariat on Racial and Ethnic Relations, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective: The Churches Amid Growing Racial Tensions in Britain*, No. 4 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1962), p. 4. Daniel, *Racial Discrimination in England*. See the following for a discussion on how this discourse still operates in the twenty-first century: Georgie Wemyss, *The Invisible Empire: White Discourse, Tolerance and Belonging* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

responsibility for wider and more subtle acts. One can see this tactic in action through the blaming of 'hooligans' for the white violence of 1958, as was shown above. Similarly, Paul Gilroy and Anandi Ramamurthy have criticised the 1970s Anti-Nazi League and Rock Against Racism movement for locating racism in this kind of figure.⁴⁸

In April and May 1962, Revd Daisuke Kitagawa, a Japanese-American theologian from the World Council of Churches (WCC), visited England in his capacity of secretary responsible for the problems of 'interracial relations', in order to make a survey of the activities of the 'British' churches in respect of 'race relations'.⁴⁹ Kitagawa's report was clearly predicated in concerns over the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of that year which was seen as controversial and as signifying a new chapter in British 'race relations'. Kitagawa noted that 'With few exceptions all those with whom I talked agreed that it is an unfortunate legislation in that it has officially exposed that race prejudice exists in Britain'.⁵⁰ Upon his return to Geneva, Kitagawa sent out a draft report for feedback to those he had consulted on his trip. Some respondents such as Nadine Peppard from the London Council for Social Service (and later NCCI and the Community Relations Commission), the Bristol Road Methodist Church in Birmingham, and the Conference of Missionary Societies were unhappy with various aspects of the report. It was claimed that the report was too harsh on the 'host' population and also in its analysis of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act. In contrast David Mason from the Notting Hill Methodist Church and his ally Donald Chesworth from the LCC, both of whom we shall learn much more about, were largely in agreement with Kitagawa's report which was finally revised, expanded, and published as part of the *Race Relations in Ecumenical*

48 Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (London: Duke University Press, 2012), p. 150. Paul Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1987, repr. 2008), pp. 170ff. Ramamurthy, *Black Star*, pp. 47–78.

49 In fact, Kitagawa only visited English cities: London, Manchester, Bradford, and Birmingham. Revd Daisuke Kitagawa was born in Japan in 1910 but moved to the USA in 1937 to do further seminary training. During the period that the USA and Japan were at war, he was interned in a relocation camp in California where he served as a minister to other Japanese prisoners. However, he went on to work closely with the WCC in several posts: secretary for the WCC ecumenical study on common responsibility in areas of rapid social change, 1956–1959; secretary for the WCC secretariat on racial and ethnic relations, 1960–1962; and executive secretary for urban and industrial mission, 1968–70. World Council of Churches Archives (WCC), 99.0.K, Kitagawa, Daisuke, born 23.10.1910, Taihoku, Japan. Died 27.3.1970, Verbier, Switzerland, n.d. c. 1970. Douglas A. Bushy, The Episcopal Church, Kitagawa Bio Press Release, n.d. c. 28 April 1965.

50 WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, p. 7.

Perspective series in November 1962.⁵¹

As well as calling for a 'race relations' body to be set up in the BCC, something that would not be *formally* acted upon until 1971, Kitagawa also made reference to the 'ambivalence' of the white English public as underscored by 'race relations' professionals.⁵² Emphasising this so-called ambivalence was another way of constructing the myth of tolerance and it is clear that this myth did not ring true with Kitagawa as he problematised it in several ways. Firstly, he noted that whilst very few English people were *considered* prejudiced, 'no one can deny that coloured people are, in one way or another, to some degree or another, discriminated against in employment, in housing, and in other areas of social relations'. He asked what this discrimination signified: preferences in class or taste? Non-racialised in-group / out-group preferences? Or, he suggested, were the English more racially prejudiced than they realised or were prepared to admit?⁵³

Kitagawa also considered there to be a strong element of fear in the response of white English people to black migrants. In probing the nature or roots of the fear, he asked,

Is there any 'legitimate' ground for such a fear? What is it exactly that is feared? It is something that is mathematically or otherwise measurable, e.g. the loss of employment opportunities, housing, etc.? If so, is it based on some objective survey of what is really going on, or simply stemming from the 'image' of the unemployment of the 30's? Is it fear of the loss of social status, or the loss of the 'whiteness' of blood in one's descendants? How much of it is based on myths and how much on facts? If myths, how can they be dispelled? One must realize that psychologically, *myths are often much more of a portent [sic] reality than facts*, especially in group-psychology.⁵⁴

Given the proximity of the white violence against black people which had

51 WCC, 4223.0.03, Daisuke Kitagawa, The Churches and Race Relations in Britain: Impressions gained from a preliminary enquiry made with the aid of the Race Relations Institute April 27 – May 4 1962, May 1962. Letter from Nadine Peppard to Daisuke Kitagawa, 24 August 1962. Letter from Harold Cook to Daisuke Kitagawa, 12 July 1962. Letter from Frank Short to Daisuke Kitagawa, 23 July 1962. Letter from David Mason to Daisuke Kitagawa, 17 August 1962. Letter from Donald Chesworth to Daisuke Kitagawa, 17 August 1962. WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*.

52 Whilst operating in ad-hoc ways on the issue of 'race' and 'immigration' before then, the Community and Race Relations Unit (CRRU) was not formally set up by the BCC until 1971. WCC, 4223.0.04, Memorandum from Daisuke Kitagawa to General Secretariat of WCC and BCC on Race Relations in Britain, 21 August 1962.

53 WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, p. 4.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 4, *emphasis mine*.

occurred just four years prior, it is interesting that Kitagawa discerned a fear on the part of the *white* public. Kitagawa noted how white people pushed those events into the past in order to claim that there was no racism in England. He said, 'the average Englishman would sooner forget them as things of the past. "We have no race or colour prejudice", they would say, "why should there be any trouble, as long as 'they' behave themselves in our country"'. He asked how this attitude should be defined? 'Complacency, smugness or evasiveness (unwillingness to face facts) or something else?'.⁵⁵ Likewise, he recorded the reluctance of white people to change their ways which he considered necessary to any real attempt of integration. He also noted the great deal of latent tensions under the skin of English society, nestling there, he said, 'like boils'. Furthermore, he noted the ease in which whites were easily swayed by 'propagandists, rabble-rousers and hate-mongers' of which England had its fair share.⁵⁶

In his sustained attempts to politely disrupt the myth of tolerance, Kitagawa listed seven examples of the 'fictions, myths and stereotypes' of English racial prejudice and posed one strategic question in response in order to problematise the myths. Firstly, in response to assertions that black people self-segregated, he asked if it was really their choice? Given the importance of this viewpoint, he later returned to it noting that there was a distinct refusal on the part of white people to integrate with black people. He said that because of this, whilst white people may have at first resented black people, now it was black people's turn to resent whites. Indeed, he explained how 'foreigners' were *made* by white English attitudes and how these attitudes created 'ghettos' and self-segregation. Furthermore, he stated that white people were unable to understand the mental and emotional strain daily endured by black people due to a refusal to try to put themselves in the shoes of 'overseas people'.⁵⁷

Secondly, in respect of claims that black people refused to adapt their behaviour to English social norms, he asked two questions: should black people first feel *accepted by* English society, or first have the will to conform? In respect of white people, should they first *accept the newcomers as they are*, or see them

55 WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, pp. 4–7, quotes from p. 7.

56 *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8.

57 *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 14.

conform to English ways of life? As noted above, the final publication was a toned down version of the unpublished report. In the unpublished document he questioned, 'Have they not been driven to feel that no matter how hard they may try they will not be accepted by the British people as their equals?'. In response to a third assertion that black people had no concept of time and were always late, he asked if this was due to not having adjusted to the rhythms of urban and industrial life?⁵⁸

Fourthly, after claims that black people overrated their occupational skills and 'cried racism' when refused jobs because of this, he asked if it was fair to judge everyone's occupational experience by British standards? Would it not be better to test applicants' skills objectively before hiring or rejecting them? (Or, in the earlier version, 'How can a man who has grown up overseas have had apprenticeship according to the regulations specified by the British Labour Unions?'.) Fifthly, in reply to assertions that house prices went down when a neighbouring one was bought by a black family, he asked what the 'race' of a neighbour had to do with house prices? (Or, 'What if one did not care who one's neighbour is and therefore had no intention of either moving out of the neighbourhood or selling the house?', thereby underscoring the racism and 'white flight' causing the property devaluations.)⁵⁹

In reply to the sixth assertion that black people expected special treatment and special invitations to church, he asked if it wasn't a bit much to ask *any* Christian in *any* unfamiliar country to attend church without a welcome? And in response to the final claim that black people had no manners or social courtesy in that they refused to come to special tea parties, he asked of the function of a tea party in English society – was it a normal way of expressing friendship? Were black people expressing shyness or resistance by their absence from these parties, and if so, why? As well as highlighting the artificiality of such extensions of 'friendship', Kitagawa also cautioned against allowing superficial contact to confirm racial stereotypes. He said, 'Seeing coloured people with one's own eyes day in and day out does not necessarily mean knowing them as they

58 WCC, 4223.0.03, Daisuke Kitagawa, *The Churches and Race Relations in Britain*, Not For Publication, n.d., c. 1962. WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, pp. 13–15.

59 WCC, 4223.0.03, Daisuke Kitagawa, *The Churches and Race Relations in Britain*, Not For Publication, n.d., c. 1962. WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, pp. 13–15.

ought to be known'.⁶⁰

What Kitagawa's report showed is that the myth of tolerance was not easily sustained when viewed with outsiders' eyes. It was a white discourse for white ears, a lullaby for a sound and guiltless sleep, a feel-good fiction which fell apart the moment the gaze of 'the other' fell upon it. Or, as in the case of white, Christian anti-racist activists like the Dummetts above, one can see how a sustained and radical rejection of received points of view caused the myth to disappear into thin air. But more than that, even were the tolerance to be a fact, Kitagawa reminded his readers that,

As long as overseas people are regarded as 'immigrants' – strangers who do not really belong to English society, however much service be rendered to them, race relations will not improve. Overseas people must cease to be merely 'they' but become a part of 'we', so that they not only receive the kindness of English people but participate with English people in the total life of English society. This means *inter alia* that Englishman's outlook of overseas people in their midst must undergo a radical change [...]. *They have come to England not as intruders or guests but as those who belong and have belonged to her long before their arrival there.* As one observer has said "the Empire is coming home" with them.⁶¹

Writing in 2010, Sara Ahmed noted how the figure of the 'stranger' (aka the 'immigrant' or 'coloured person', etc.) serves to produce who 'we' are by fitting into the map of the world as the very thing which defines and constructs our boundaries. Despite the passing of nearly 50 years between Kitagawa and Ahmed's observations, it is highly questionable whether or not 'they' have become 'we'. Ahmed further writes that it is the very proximity of the stranger *within* the nation space as an unassimilable entity which 'is a mechanism for the demarcation of the national body, a way of defining borders within it, rather than just between it and an imagined exterior other'.⁶² It is interesting to remember alongside this, that the open and borderless British nationality was only scaled

60 WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, pp. 4, 13–15.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 16, *emphasis his, emphasis mine*. One suspects that, as a Japanese-American in Britain, Kitagawa's lived cosmopolitanism facilitated his point of view. It is interesting to note that his suggestion that England must change to reflect its new citizens was still considered 'radical' by the 'race relations' establishment some seven years later. See: Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 371.

62 Sara Ahmed, *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 24, 100. Similarly James Baldwin insisted that it was precisely the distance between the metropole and the colonies which enabled Britain to sidestep issues of 'race' *vis-à-vis* the USA. See: Robert William Waters, "'Britain is no longer white": James Baldwin as a Witness to Postcolonial Britain', *African American Review*, 46 (2013), 715–730 (pp. 722, 724).

back and redefined once those 'strangers' had entered what was clearly, in the end, the nation proper.

The Racism of White Christians

What then of the elephant in the room: the racism of white Christians? The thesis has a focus on the work white Christians engaged in in order to attempt to counter racism as this has enabled a more nuanced, detailed, and multifaceted (and less depressing) story to be written: there was more to white Christian responses to black people than just racism. However, this is not to discount both the outright racism of white Christians in the post-war period, and the unimaginative failures of the historic majority-white churches to make space for black Christians more generally. Black and white Christians and scholars of 'religions' have documented the racisms expressed towards black Christians, which were generally expressed by an enforcement of segregation in covert or overt ways: by behaving coldly and distantly to black arrivals at church, or more blatantly by telling first-time black visitors to not come back. The *West Indian Gazette* even reported on the tragic story of a young Jamaican woman in England who committed suicide in 1961 because she was denied her wish of becoming a deaconess due to her colour.⁶³

63 Io Smith and Wendy Green, *An Ebony Cross: Being a Black Christian in Britain Today* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1989), pp. 31–43. Anita Jackson, *Catching Both Sides of the Wind: Conversations with Five Black Pastors* (London: British Council of Churches, 1985). Gus John, 'The Churches and Race', *Race Today*, 2 (1970), 344–346. Black Cultural Archives (BCA), Record/1/23, Interview with Bishop Wilfred Wood and Jeillo Edwards, n.d., c. 1990s. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Ivan Weekes, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gene Martin, June 2004. Lambeth Palace Archives (LPA), Ramsey 75, ff. 116. Joe Aldred, *Respect: Understanding Caribbean British Christianity* (Peterborough: Epworth, 2005), p. vii. Vanessa Howard, *A Report on Afro-Caribbean Christianity in Britain: Community Religions Research Papers* (Leeds: University of Leeds, 1987), pp. 9–10. John Fethney, 'Prejudice and Churchgoers', *Race Today*, 5 (1973), 10–12. Robert Hughes, 'Immigrants and the Churches', *Alta: The University of Birmingham Review*, 4 (1967–1968), 216–223 (pp. 220–221). 'West Indians Tolerated but Not Accepted. Westhill Survey in Birmingham', *Methodist Recorder*, 7 September 1961, p. 4. 'Immigrants: Why We Fail', *Methodist Recorder*, 12 November 1964, p. 1. 'Because She Could Not Go Home A Failure - Jamaican Girl's Suicide', *West Indian Gazette*, Vol. 3, No. 6, April 1961, p. 8. Clifford Hill was of the opinion that the stories of racism and rejection were not generally verifiable. However, he thought them important because of they expressed a *feeling* of rejection even if not empirically true. See his: *Black and White in Harmony* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958), pp. 100–103. *West Indian Migrants and the London Churches* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1963), pp. 6, 29–38. 'From Church to Sect: West Indian Religious Sect Development in Britain', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 10 (1971), 114–123 (p. 117). 'Pentecostalist Growth – Result of Racialism?', *Race Today*, 3 (1971), 187–190.

Gus John has stated that some black people stopped practising Christianity altogether because of this racism, and indeed, he is a former Dominican Friar and Oxford theology student who left the church and his theology PhD because of these issues. This departure from the church was also noted by sociologists of the period such as Sheila Patterson and Clifford Hill. Rather than racism *per se* (it was never racism), they tied it to the emptiness of churches, the style of services, the average age of white parishioners (much older than the black migrants), the long hours migrants worked, and the frequency with which migrants had to move. Another factor was class: black migrants tended to be considered working-class irrespective of their particular background, and given that working-class whites did not attend church, why then should black people? To this end, exceptionally high drop-off rates were cited: Clifford Hill stated that whereas sixty-nine percent of Caribbean people attended church in the Caribbean, only four percent of Caribbean people did so once in England. Similarly, Sheila Patterson said that ninety-four percent of the Caribbean migrants who had previously attended church in the Caribbean failed to do so once in London. Patterson did, however, mention that the free churches were much more successful in retaining Caribbean attendance, and, alongside the 1969 *Colour and Citizenship* report, she singled out the Notting Hill Methodist Church in this respect.⁶⁴

The growth of black-led, or black-majority, churches was also intimately connected to the experiences of rejection from the historic majority-white churches, although it is not the sole explanatory factor. The widely respected scholar of black and Pentecostal Christianity, Roswith Gerloff, stated that whilst rejection by whites was an important factor in the growth of black-led churches in Britain, it was only part of the story. Gerloff stated that these churches also grew because they were indigenous to the Caribbean and had a history of supporting disadvantaged black Christians, as well as offering black people a

64 DCA, PP2/94, World Council of Churches, Secretariat for Migration, Consultation of Jamaican Churches, Kingston, 30 April to 5 May 1962. John, 'The Churches and Race', p. 344. Sheila Patterson, *Dark Strangers: A Sociological Study of the Absorption of a Recent West Indian Migrant Group in Brixton, South London* (London: Tavistock, 1963), p. 254. Hill, *Black and White in Harmony*, pp. 19–21, 23. Hill, *West Indian Migrants*, pp. 5–8, 22–23. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 372–375, 389. Hughes, 'Immigrants and the Churches', pp. 218, 220. David Pearson, *Race, Class and Political Activism: A Study of West Indians in Britain* (Farnborough: Gower, 1981), pp. 126–129. Sheila Patterson, *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain, 1960–1967* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1969), pp. 330–331.

sense of spiritual belonging, a functioning organisation, a feeling of being in harmony with 'poor people's Christianity', and the possibility of leadership roles.⁶⁵

There was at this time some anxiety over the rise of black-led churches on the part of white Christians, which is particularly evident in the work of Clifford Hill.⁶⁶ Again, refusing to engage with the experiences of racism, some white Christians claimed that different styles of worship in the Caribbean were the primary reason for the growth of black-led churches. In contrast, and in keeping with his problematising of the myth of tolerance shown above, Revd Daisuke Kitagawa reported that both Caribbean Christians and white missionaries who had worked in the Caribbean stated that there was little difference between the style of worship in the historic churches in England and in the same denominations in the Caribbean.⁶⁷ Therefore, Kitagawa said that the 'coldness' referred to by Caribbean people was in fact in reference to the attitudes of white Christians and not the style of service. As such, Kitagawa asserted that the rise of Pentecostal churches was a way of releasing pent up emotions, rather than transplanting specifically Caribbean forms of worship.⁶⁸ One might ask if the theories that black people worshipped differently and therefore desired and required their own services, was actually a way of enforcing segregation within the Christian community. Moreover, these theories served as a mechanism for sidestepping any acknowledgement of the white racism which pushed black Christians away.

The deeply personal and painful experiences of racism and rejection on the part of black Christians and the growth of black-led churches were married with more structural critiques of the historic churches and their relationship to Empire

65 Roswith Gerloff, *et. al.*, *Partnership in Black and White* (London: Methodist Home Mission, 1977), p. 13. See also: Hill, *Black and White in Harmony*, p. 22. Aldred, *Respect*, pp. 87–90. In respect of leadership roles, Clifford Hill stated that it was a tragedy that the many experienced Caribbean lay preachers, deacons, readers, etc., were not called into these roles by the historic English churches. See: Hill, *West Indian Migrants*, pp. 34–35.

66 Clifford Hill, *Black Churches: West Indian and African sects in Britain* (London: British Council of Churches, Community and Race Relations Unit, 1971). Hill, 'From Church to Sect'. Hill, 'Pentecostalist Growth'. Hill, *West Indian Migrants*. Rose, *et. al.* were critical of Hill in this respect, noting that his attitude undermined his otherwise good work. See their: *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 371, 400 n. 5.

67 Although *c.f.* Revd Norwyn Denny, 'London Churches Welcome West Indians', *Methodist Recorder*, 18 January 1962, p. 6.

68 WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, p. 11. Clifford Hill confirms this point of view in his *Black and White in Harmony*, pp. 58–60.

and the civilising mission. For, despite any complexities and contradictions raised by historians surrounding a *specifically* missionary imperialism, it is still true to say that the churches were deeply involved with colonial governments and imperial expansion, and that many were used to buttress colonial authority. In using this institutional position to construct Christianity and the churches as morally superior in order to supplant indigenous belief systems and to inculcate Caribbean people into becoming loyal British subjects through education systems, the churches placed themselves in a position it has subsequently become easy to attack.⁶⁹

More important than how modern historians have constructed the churches' relationship to colonialism, is how black people in the sixties, Christian and otherwise, understood this relationship themselves. For, as Sivanandan said during his speech at the 1969 WCC Consultation on White Racism, the 'racial problem' needed to be considered in human terms: the abstract and theoretical must be translated into the personal.⁷⁰ As such, during the sixties we find non-Christian black radicals such as Roy Sawh and Sivanandan highlighting the Christian roots of language which degraded blackness as 'sinful' and elevated whiteness as a symbol of 'purity'.⁷¹ Whereas black Christians (and those who had been raised in the church) like Revd (later Bishop) Wood, Gus John, and James Baldwin noted how Christianity was seen as a tool which assisted colonialism, and therefore as an institution responsible for the subjugation and oppression of their forebears.⁷² This was further underscored by how few white people practised Christianity in England. This lack of adherence made Christianity seem even more of a tool for which to control non-white others.

69 Andrew Porter, 'Religion, Missionary Enthusiasm, and Empire', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III, The Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Andrew Porter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 222–246. Sarah Stockwell, "'Splendidly Leading the Way"? Archbishop Fisher and Decolonisation in British Colonial Africa', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36 (2008), 545–564. Brian L. Moore and Michele A. Johnson, *Neither Led Nor Driven: Contesting British Cultural Imperialism in Jamaica, 1865-1920* (Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press, 2004). Anne Spry Rush, *Bonds of Empire: West Indians and Britishness from Victoria to Decolonization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

70 Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Race: The Revolutionary Experience', *Race Today*, 1 (1969), 108–109 (p. 108).

71 *Ibid.*, p. 108. Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'The Liberation of the Black Intellectual', in *A Different Hunger*, by Sivanandan, pp. 82–98. Roy Sawh, 'Black Power in Britain', in *Justice First*, ed. by Donnelly, pp. 123–139 (p. 126).

72 Whilst Baldwin was an American, he was widely read in England, including by Christians. See: Waters, "'Britain is no longer white'", 715–730.

Generally speaking, the strong involvement of Christianity with Empire had generated a fundamental distrust of it amongst some black people. Viewed from England, the relationship of the church with the established, oppressive culture and status quo meant that it could not properly stand with the poor and the oppressed, despite what Christ had preached.⁷³ As we shall see in Chapters One and Six, this type of critique eventually became central to how the WCC understood the history of Christianity and was consequentially used as a signpost to direct the organisation and its member churches to a new, just and globally emancipatory, future.

Given that 'Christianity and its institutions, the churches, form one of the fundamental transnational networks in modern history', one would have expected that the churches would have been the first port of call for newly arrived migrants from Christian backgrounds. Moreover, given Christianity's alleged emphasis on the 'equality of man' and the simple geographical fact of the spread of churches all over the country, one would have thought that, of all the English institutions, the churches were best placed to combat racism.⁷⁴ However, in actual fact the truth was that, much like the situation in Germany, the English churches almost totally failed to 'globalise locally' in the sixties.⁷⁵ It is unfortunate that, much like wider English society, the invitation to engage with and embrace internationalism and diasporic beings, was not accepted by many white Christians at this time. This is, in truth, the skeleton of the story, but life is more than bare bones. As such, what follows adds flesh to this starkly simple

73 Wilfred Wood and John Downing, *Vicious Circle* (London: SPCK, 1968), pp. 43–44. John, 'The Churches and Race', p. 345. 'A Look at Britain', in *Race: A Christian Symposium*, ed. by Clifford S. Hill and David Mathews (London: Victor Gollancz, 1968), pp. 153–169 (p. 166). James Baldwin, 'Down at the Cross', in *The Fire Next Time* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963, repr. 1973), pp. 19–89 (pp. 44–46). John, 'The Black Experience of Britain', p. 17. Stockwell, "'Splendidly Leading the Way"?", p. 554.

74 Katharina Kunter, 'Introduction', in *Changing Relations Between Churches in Europe and Africa: The Internationalization of Christianity and Politics in the 20th Century*, ed. by Katharina Kunter and Jens Holger Schjorring (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008), pp. 3–7 (p. 3). Hill, *West Indian Migrants*, pp. 7–8, 75. Wood and Downing, *Vicious Circle*, p. 66. Hughes, 'Immigrants and the Churches', pp. 218–219.

75 In other words, the English churches did not adequately change to reflect the growing interconnected nature of the world and the growing movement of peoples and shifts in demographics. As Rose, *et. al.* said, 'many Churchman and immigrants feel that the Churches have failed locally to help them in a way that they should'. *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 375. See also: Sebastian Tripp, 'Das Programm zur Bekämpfung des Rassismus und die "Glokalisierung" der Kirchen', in *Globalisierung der Kirchen: Der Ökumenische Rat der Kirchen und die Entdeckung der Dritten Welt in den 1960er und 1970er Jahren*, ed. by Katharina Kunter and Annegreth Schilling (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), pp. 297–311.

narrative of racism and rejection by way of telling the story of the different ways in which *some* Christians and churches engaged with, and embraced, the newcomers to their communities. Sometimes failing, sometimes succeeding, and always in a variety of ways.

Before going further, three notes on terminology must be made. Firstly, the term 'black' is being used in this thesis to refer to all people of colour although it is admitted that this is not an entirely unproblematic ascription. The term is somewhat anachronistic for the first half of the decade, but emerged in the second half of the decade as a response to the white racism which had homogenised various disparate and different non-white groups as 'coloured'. As Tony Soares has said, 'we didn't like the word coloured... So we became black'.⁷⁶ Despite Soares' identification with political blackness, and alongside him other Asian intellectuals such as Sivanandan, it is debatable how many working-class Asian migrants identified with the idea of political blackness.⁷⁷ To this end, Darcus Howe has said that 'rank and file' Asian migrants tended not to be involved in black radical organisations in London. In turn, Tariq Modood considers the idea of political blackness harmful to Asian people and has made an argument to use ethno-religious markers and identities instead.⁷⁸ Despite these difficulties and tensions, black is used throughout the thesis as it most accurately represents how the non-white residents of Notting Hill articulated themselves and because Christians generally were more concerned with people of African and Caribbean heritage than they were with Asian people throughout most of the decade. Similarly, 'Caribbean' will be used in place of the more common usage of 'West Indian' at that time.⁷⁹

76 As cited by, Anne-Marie Angelo, "'We All Became Black": Tony Soares, African-American Internationalists, and Anti-imperialism', in *The Other Special Relationship*, ed. by Kelley and Tuck, pp. 95–101, quote from p. 97.

77 See Sivanandan's writing in general, but especially, 'The Liberation of the Black Intellectual', pp. 82–98. See also: Ramamurthy, 'The Politics of Britain's Asian Youth Movements'.

78 Robin Bunce and Paul Field, *Darcus Howe: A Political Biography* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), p. 138. Tariq Modood, 'Political Blackness and British Asians,' *Sociology*, 28 (1994), 859–876. See also, Tariq Modood, "'Black", Racial Equality and Asian Identity,' *New Community*, 14 (1988), 397–404.

79 Rose, *et. al.*, suggest that this lack of attention is due to a lack of proselytising by Christians to Asians in Britain. Christian interest in other ethno-religious groups began in around 1966–7. The corresponding rise of 'inter-faith' work is deserving of further attention. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 376–377. For a preliminary study of Asian people and multiculturalism see: David Feldman, 'Why the English like Turbans: Multicultural Politics in

Secondly, 'race' is problematised to signify the general agreement that 'race' does not have any legitimacy as a scientific category and that it therefore does not exist in any meaningful sense. This is also true for the term 'ethnicity' which is now the primary marker of differentiation over 'race', although the term was not typically used in the sixties. However, despite there being a consensus that 'race' itself does not exist, it is agreed that the various political implications, social actions, and ideologies which the category 'race' gives rise to, are of a great significance and are an obvious focus for this thesis. The problematisation of 'race' also dictates the problematisation of 'race relations'.⁸⁰

Thirdly, this thesis will not use the terms 'immigrants' or 'immigration' to refer to post-war black migrants to England, preferring instead to use the terms migrants and migration. It is acknowledged that there are dominant discourses and narratives of 'immigration' and 'immigrants' upon which the basis of this study is formed: the impact of the *idea* of 'immigration' is undisputed in this sense. It underpins why arrivals from the 'New Commonwealth' were excluded and discriminated against. However, the perspective taken here is that you cannot be an immigrant to a country which you are already a citizen of; you are, instead, moving or migrating to another part of the realm.⁸¹ What if these citizens arriving in the heart of Empire were, in fact, articulated by the State and the media as kin? As citizens. As those with a *right* to existence within the borders of this island. As those with centuries of historical connections which deeply bound their bodies and their lives to the structures of society, to the bricks and stones of the buildings, to the foods on the table, the drinks in the cups, and the clothes on peoples' backs, even if their physical presence in this particular space was new.⁸² Perhaps then the events and struggles which this

British History', in *Structures and Transformations in Modern British History*, ed. by David Feldman and Jon Lawrence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 281–302.

80 John Solomos, *Race and Racism in Britain, 3rd Edition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), p. 10. Gail Lewis and Ann Phoenix, "'Race", "ethnicity" and identity', in *questioning identity: gender, class, ethnicity*, ed. by Kath Woodward (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 115–150 (pp. 116–117, 124). Paul Gilroy, *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 11–53. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s, Second Edition* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 14–15.

81 Whilst many south Asian migrants may not have been British citizens, they did have a long and embedded history with Britain and England, so the larger point being made stands.

82 People of colour did not, of course, first appear on this island in the post-war period, but it was largely articulated in that fashion at the time. Hence the rise of histories of immigration in the eighties which sought to contest this erroneously held idea. See, for instance, the references given in n. 14.

thesis seeks to shed light upon would never have occurred, or, at the very least, they would not have occurred in the same way.

What is being suggested here then, is that, *in this respect*, 'immigration' can be seen to be socially constructed in a similar way as that of 'race' or 'ethnicity'. Therefore, it is suggested that the classification of the arrival of black migrants in England in the post-war period as an act of *immigration*, as opposed to the movement of citizens around the wider British territories, has had profound implications for how those people were (and are) understood in wider society and public histories.⁸³ Rather than being fellow citizens, these people (and their children) became 'immigrants', foreign, strangers, 'Other', pushed outside of the scope of Englishness or Britishness, and in doing so, our histories and connections were erased. Therefore, like Sivanandan, this thesis would assert that,

colonialism and immigration were part of the same continuum – [...] we were settlers and not immigrants, citizens not aliens. The purpose of my aphorism 'we are here because you were there' was to capture the idea of the continuum in a sentence intelligible to all.⁸⁴

This 'erasure of history' is also noted by the historians Kathleen Paul and Wendy Webster, and is also argued eloquently by Sara Ahmed in *Strange Encounters*, wherein she states that people become strangers precisely by the act of forgetting the histories of how we are connected.⁸⁵ This use of history is something that shall be returned to throughout the thesis.

This thesis is then in the first instance a two-fold affair: it seeks to highlight the

83 This suggestion is being raised solely in respect of 'New Commonwealth' migrants, and/or those people who Britain had a (former) colonial relationship with.

84 Sivanandan as quoted by Gordon, 'On "Lived Theory"', p. 2. Whilst Sivanandan uses the term settler, it is read here in opposition to the term 'immigrant' and in this sense is in congruence with the use of the term 'migrant'.

85 Kathleen Paul, 'From Subjects to Immigrants: Black Britons and National Identity, 1948-62', in *The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain, 1930-1960*, ed. by Richard Weight and Abigail Beach (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998), pp. 223–248 (p. 231). Wendy Webster, 'The Empire Comes Home: Commonwealth Migration to Britain', in *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Andrew Thompson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 122–160 (pp. 125–126). Ahmed, *Strange Encounters*, p. 9. It is important to note that Ahmed is not solely referring to colonial histories. Likewise, sticking to connections forged through migrations, Adam McKeown makes the important point that historical migrations and connections were not always about European colonialism, nor did they solely occur within the Atlantic region. See his: 'Global Migration 1846-1940', *Journal of World History*, 15 (2004), 155–189.

continual and habitual construction of the myth of tolerance throughout the 1960s through 'race relations' discourse, whilst at the same time being a sustained attempt to disrupt said myth. As was noted above, without a recognition of the racism within the nation's borders there cannot be a proper appreciation of the work of activists to challenge it. For, as the myth of tolerance would have it, there is no real racism in the nation for activists to contest, outwith that which is contained within the ostracised figure of 'The Racist'. Ergo, as Tuck noted, it is erroneously believed there was no equivalent of the US Civil Rights struggles in England, hence a lack of historical studies of racism and 'race relations' in England.⁸⁶ In this way, racism remains securely out there, outside the nation's borders. Therefore, like Kushner and like Holmes, this thesis is then an attempt to challenge the popular idea of an essentially tolerant nation and an attempt to write in an important aspect of English history.⁸⁷

The work of Christians in the field of 'race relations' has been chosen to concentrate on both to give the thesis focus, but also because of the general absence of Christians from many social and cultural histories of the sixties, irrespective of the area of focus. As Simon Green has said, most recent histories of Britain 'might for all practical purposes be defined as "history with the religion left out"', which is unfortunate given the fact that 'religion' and Christianity was an important aspect of twentieth-century life, and remains so in the twenty-first century.⁸⁸ By way of addressing this absence, the thesis will approach the engagement of Christians in 'race relations' using two different tactics. Firstly, it will broadly look at how Christians participated in the field of English 'race relations', and secondly it will take a more in-depth perspective by telling the story of a particular Methodist church in Notting Hill. Notting Hill, for reasons outlined above, obviously holds a significant place in the history of 'race' and 'race relations' in England, and it is hoped that by telling the story of

86 See n. 32 above.

87 See n. 14 above.

88 S.J.D. Green, *The Passing of Protestant England: Secularisation and Social Change, C. 1920-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 3–25, quote from p. 6. Alongside Green, this absence has also been noted by Matthew Grimley, Adrian Hastings, Sam Brewitt-Taylor, and Alistair Chapman. See: Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', p. 207. Adrian Hastings, *A History of English Christianity: 1920-1990* (London: SCM Press, 1991), p. ix. Sam Brewitt-Taylor, "Christian Radicalism" in the Church of England, 1957-70' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2012), pp. 12–13. Alistair Chapman, 'Civil Religions in Derby, 1930-2000', *The Historical Journal*, 2016 (FirstView), 1–27 (p. 3). See comments below for the reason why the term 'religion' is problematised.

this church, the thesis will shed *detailed* light not only on the engagement of Christians in the field of 'race relations', but also on an example of the radical restatement of Christianity in the sixties. In this way, to paraphrase Bernadette McAliskey, it is hoped that the recovery of lost histories can be done through the telling of small stories.⁸⁹ Importantly too, since much 'race relations' work was devolved to local institutions, it is in these particularities that the myriad stories relating to 'race' and 'race relations' are to be found.⁹⁰

There have been only two texts which can strictly be called *histories* of 'race relations' in Britain or England, neither of which are particularly recent.⁹¹ Dilip Hiro's *Black British, White British* takes a holistic point of view and covers community organisations including 'religious' organisations, inter-generational conflict, white racism, strikes, and Asian entrepreneurship throughout. Hiro outlines an inherent tension in the way Britain would like to understand itself morally – as having a regard for the dignity and equality of human life – and the actual socio-historical reality of Empire and colonialism. Harry Goulbourne's *Race Relations in Britain Since 1945* is less of a history and more of a socio-historical analysis of the field. Goulbourne's focus is 'top down' but he does make passing reference to the fact that the most resilient organisations within black and Asian communities have been 'religiously' based, and also that black-led churches have refrained from getting involved in political matters.⁹²

More recently, historians such as Robin Kelley and Stephen Tuck have explored

89 Bernadette McAliskey, the Irish political activist, made this point during a talk on 'Ireland's Easter Rising - A Revolutionary Legacy' held at Bloomsbury Central Baptist Church on 7 March 2016. A similar call is made by Alister Chapman following James Hinton. See: Chapman, 'Civil Religions', p. 5. James Hinton, *Nine wartime lives: Mass-Observation and the making of the modern self* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 204–205.

90 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 381.

91 There is, of course, an abundance of *sociological* literature on 'race' and 'race relations' in England or Britain. See, for instance: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and racism in 70s Britain* (London: Hutchinson, 1982, repr. 1983). Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black*. Paul Gilroy, *After Empire: Melancholia or convivial culture?* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004, repr. 2006). Harry Goulbourne, *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Post-Imperial Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Solomos, *Race and Racism in Britain*. Les Back and John Solomos, eds., *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999). Karim Murji and John Solomos, eds., *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). Mark Johnson, 'The Spirit still moves in the inner city: the churches and race', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 11 (1988), 366–373.

92 Hiro, *Black British*, p. 10. Harry Goulbourne, *Race Relations in Britain Since 1945* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 73–74. See the following for a study of black-led churches and social engagement: Doreen McCalla, 'Black Churches and Voluntary Action: Their Social Engagement with the Wider Society', *Black Theology: An International Journal*, 3 (2005), 137–175.

'race' in post-war Britain through transatlantic connections. *The Other Special Relationship* explores these connections in detail and in doing so, helps the reader to understand why so many (politically) black activists drew on the American situation and used American language in their fights in Britain, despite racism manifesting differently in each country. However, despite a rich collection of chapters spanning short biographies of key figures and longer comparative essays, the book does not include a chapter on Christianity or 'religion' more generally. Tuck's *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union* is similarly rooted in a concern to trace these transatlantic relationships. Whilst ostensibly about 'one night' in British history, the book richly contextualises the moment in time and space, speaking on Malcolm's life *and* on 'race' in Oxford. Tuck does make some reference to Christian involvement in British 'race relations': for instance the 1951 World Methodist Conference, and Kenneth Leech's involvement in 'race relations' in Oxford. However, because of the scope and focus of the book, sustained reference to Christianity and Christians is not given.⁹³

Given the racialisation of post-war 'immigration' to Britain, attention must also be paid to histories of 'immigration'. This body of literature, whether it be histories of 'immigration' in a general sense, histories of specific 'immigrant' groups or populations, and histories of the various post-war Immigration and Nationality Acts largely ignore 'religion'.⁹⁴ This absence is also found in respect of those histories which have been concerned with reconnecting British and Imperial histories, such as the work of Catherine Hall and Sonya Rose, Wendy Webster, Bill Schwarz, and Andrew Thompson.⁹⁵ Likewise in respect of

93 Robin D.G. Kelley, and Stephen Tuck, eds., *The Other Special Relationship: Race, Rights, and Riots in Britain and the United States* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, pp. 65–67, 105–106.

94 For general 'immigration' histories see, for instance: Holmes, *John Bull's Island*. Walvin, *Passage to Britain*. Winder, *Bloody Foreigners*. Kushner, *The Battle of Britishness*. For histories of specific 'immigrant' groups see, for instance: Visram, *Asians in Britain*. Fryer, *Staying Power*. For histories of post-war immigration and nationality legislation see: Kathleen Paul, *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era* (London: Cornell University Press, 1997). Ian R.G. Spencer, *British Immigration Policy Since 1939: The Making of Multi-Racial Britain* (London: Routledge, 1997). Rieko Karatani, *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth and Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 2003). Randall Hansen, *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain: The Institutional Origins of a Multicultural Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). See the following for an important critique of Hansen's text: Ali Rattansi, 'The Uses of Racialization: The Time-Spaces and Subject-Objects of the Raced Body', in *Racialization*, ed. by Murji and Solomos, pp. 271–301 (pp. 274–281).

95 Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose, eds., *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture*

historians of black British radicalism such as Rob Waters, Rosalind Wild, Robin Bunce and Paul Field, and Anne-Marie Angelo.⁹⁶ Slight exceptions to this rule must be made in respect of Ron Ramdin's *The Making of the Black Working Class*, Rashmi Desai's *Indian Immigrants in Britain*, Nuala Sanderson's doctoral thesis, and for obvious reasons Gurharpal Singh and Darshan Singh Tatla's *Sikhs in Britain*.⁹⁷ Whilst both Matthew Grimley and Edson Burton have sought to fill this gap, both of their work has been limited to the Church of England and therefore leaves plenty of scope for further research.⁹⁸

In respect of the campaigning aspect of 'race relations' work, the corresponding literature would be histories which have examined social movements and extra-parliamentary organisations and pressure groups. To take Adam Lent's highly informative *British Social Movements Since 1945*, we find that it does not pay attention to Christianity nor to 'religion' more broadly. Similarly, Jodi Burkett's *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain* is a study of the anti-racist campaigning work of left-wing groups in the sixties, but she too does not include any Christian

and the Imperial World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Wendy Webster, *Englishness and Empire 1939-1965* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). Bill Schwarz, *Memories of Empire, Volume 1: The White Man's World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). Andrew Thompson, *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005).

96 Rosalind Eleanor Wild, 'Black was the colour of our fight.' Black Power in Britain, 1955-1976' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield, 2008). Robert William Waters, 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness: race, America and the end of empire' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Queen Mary University of London, 2014). Bunce and Field, *Darcus Howe*. Robin Bunce and Paul Field, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain: Black Radicalism in Britain 1967-72', *Twentieth Century British History*, 22 (2010), 391-414. Anne-Marie Angelo, 'The Black Panthers in London, 1967-1972: A Diasporic Struggle Navigates the Black Atlantic', *Radical History Review*, 103 (2009), 17-35.

97 For instance, Ramdin notes that Gurdwaras were an integral part to IWA politics, records church involvement in the West Indian Standing Conference (WISC) and the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD), and black-majority church methods of responding to white racism. Ron Ramdin, *The Making of the Black Working Class in Britain* (Aldershot: Wildwood, 1987), pp. 399-402, 410-448. Desai includes an ethnographic chapter on the associations formed by Indian migrants in which he draws sharp distinctions between 'cultural' and 'religious' organisations which obtain a longevity, and political organisations which tended to fail through lack of unity. Rashmi Desai, *Indian Immigrants in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1963), pp. 88-107. Sanderson's wide-ranging thesis explores how various groups and organisations engaged with 'immigration' and 'race relations': the press and politicians, black groups, the far-right, 'racial harmony' groups, and 'religious' groups. Because of the breadth of scope, the section on 'religion' is necessarily lacking in detail. Nuala Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality in the United States on British Racialised Relations from 1958 to 1968' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton, 1999). Gurharpal Singh and Darshan Singh Tatla, *Sikhs in Britain: The Making of a Community* (London: Zed Books, 2006).

98 See n. 2 for references.

groups. In contrast, in their recent study of NGOs in contemporary Britain, James McKay and Matthew Hilton take care to draw out the various ways in which there has been Christian involvement in NGO activity, despite the organisations themselves often not being explicitly Christian. McKay and Hilton note that NGOs are 'at the heart of every major socio-political initiative of the post-war period', and, as such, position their work amongst the wider social movement literature. They note a preoccupation with radicalism within this body of literature which has meant that more conservative reform organisations have been overlooked due to normative assumptions about what constitutes radicalism. Normative assumptions such as these could also explain the lack of attention to 'religion' in many of the texts referred to above.⁹⁹

Whilst England (or Britain more widely) clearly never had anything like the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) of the USA or a figure like Martin Luther King, Jr., these absences of fact and of historical narrative should not imply that English Christians and churches were disengaged from 'race relations' in the sixties nor the politics of 'race' more generally.¹⁰⁰ In fact, the sixties saw Roman Catholic and Protestant Christians heavily involved in many forms of social and political activism.¹⁰¹ In respect of 'race relations', as shall be shown in the subsequent chapters, Christians were active in multiple ways: from public speeches and letters, to chairing national committees, to writing texts, to working amongst their communities and congregations, to loaning buildings for the use of black-led projects, and to giving financial and moral support to black liberation projects. It is time that the story of the interesting and varied ways in which Christians of the sixties engaged with 'race' and 'race relations' was told.

99 Adam Lent, *British Social Movements Since 1945: Sex, Colour, Peace and Power* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001). Burkett, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain*. James McKay and Matthew Hilton, 'Introduction', in *NGOs in Contemporary Britain: Non-State Actors in Society and Politics Since 1945*, ed. by Nick Crowson, *et. al.* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 1–20 quote from p. 1. For more on Christian involvement in humanitarian organisations see Jeffrey Cox's chapter: 'From the Empire of Christ to the Third World: Religion and the Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century,' in *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Thompson, pp. 76–121.

100 In fact, Christians were often initially the most proactive in terms of the voluntary organisations which sprung up post-Windrush. Although proactive should not be mistaken for effective. Hill and Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations*, pp. 2–5. See the following for a good overview of the SCLC: Adam Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (London: University of Georgia Press, 1987).

101 Hugh McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 101. G.I.T. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth Century Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

When seeking to understand the exclusion of Christians from social and cultural histories of the sixties, it is clear that it is related to the narrative of the 'decline of Christianity'. This narrative itself is an aspect of a wider 'decline' thesis rooted in unresolved thoughts and feelings over the so-called 'loss of Empire' and the alleged corresponding cultural and economic decline.¹⁰² That the exceptionally rapid global, social, and cultural *changes* of the late fifties and sixties have been interpreted as representing the *decline* of Britain (or England) tells us something about how the so-called 'loss' of Empire is viewed. It is a perspective which is rooted in the assumption that the 'loss' of Empire was itself, in some way, a bad thing as it meant a loss of prestige and power to the nation. This is clearly a position of the (former) coloniser. Another position it could occupy is to view the so-called 'loss' as a moral good: a nation finally forced to its senses by peoples with justice on their side. Viewed in this way, the 'loss' is in fact better seen as part of a vast, global change which was paralleled by a variety of smaller, inter-related changes within the boundaries of England itself.

In respect of Christianity in England, the 'decline thesis' is, either implicitly or explicitly, linked to the secularisation thesis. Because an aspect of the 'decline of religion' thesis is that 'religion' has declined to the point of irrelevancy, it will be discussed here as to leave it intact is to discount the meaning of the research contained within this thesis.¹⁰³ Whilst this thesis is most commonly associated with sociologists, what is perhaps most interesting about it is that it was first developed by Christians themselves in the early part of the sixties, and only later picked up on by sociologists. To this end, Sam Brewitt-Taylor has charted a fascinating narrative of secularisation and 'decline of religion' discourses which, rather than reflecting reality, can actually be said to have 'invented a general crisis of supernaturalism' and to have 'exaggerated the

102 Jane Garnett, *et. al.*, 'Introduction', in *Redefining Christian Britain: post-1945 perspectives*, eds. by Jane Garnett, *et. al.* (London: SCM Press, 2007), pp. 1–18 (pp. 2–4). See also: Jim Tomlinson, 'Thrice Denied: "Declinism" as a Recurrent Theme in British History in the Long Twentieth Century', *Twentieth Century British History*, 20 (2009), 227–251. Jim Tomlinson, *The Politics of Decline: Understanding Post-war Britain* (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2001). Andrew Thompson and Meaghan Kowalsky, 'Social Life and Cultural Representation: Empire in the Public Imagination', in *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Thompson, pp. 251–297 (p. 259).

103 Roy Wallis and Steve Bruce, 'Secularization: The Orthodox Model', in *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis*, ed. by Steve Bruce (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 8–30 (pp. 12–14). One doubts such an argument could still be made cogently today.

extent of religious decline'.¹⁰⁴

To confirm Brewitt-Taylor's analysis, one need only to turn to the abundance of literature created by sociologists and social anthropologists in the sixties in respect of post-war migration. These texts contain ample reference to 'religion' in a variety of ways: the importance of churches to assist migrants' 'assimilation' and/or 'integration'; various aspects of the failures of British churches to aid and/or 'integrate' migrants; ethnographical descriptions of migrants' 'religious' backgrounds and institutions; 'religion' as part of group and individual identity formation; and certain 'religious' groups problematised in particular ways. These aspects of 'religion' and 'religious life' would not have received such attention and prominence in the texts if 'religion' or Christianity was perceived by social scientists as a dying, declining, or irrelevant force.¹⁰⁵

As such, the argument made here is that, not only was Christianity an important cultural force in the sixties, but that neither Christianity nor 'religion' have declined to the point of irrelevancy then or since. To begin with the former, this assertion is linked to definitions of what Christianity and 'religion' more broadly is. Most definitions of 'religion', which Christianity is deemed to be one manifestation of, are based on an easy equation between 'religion' and belief, which gives rise to the synonym of 'faith' or 'faith group'. However, this definition of 'religion' as being that of a matter of belief (and its attendant ritual practise) is highly problematic for two main reasons. Not only does a such definition mean that we fail to notice the institutionalisation of Christian values, ethics, behaviours, and norms throughout majority English culture, but it also ignores the relationship between 'religion' and 'ethnicity', and the latter's proximity to 'race' and culture. This is especially obvious when one thinks of, for instance, Judaism, Hinduism, Sikhism, or Zoroastrianism.¹⁰⁶

104 Sam Brewitt-Taylor, 'The Invention of a "Secular Society"? Christianity and the Sudden Appearance of Secularization Discourses in the British National Media, 1961-4,' *Twentieth Century British History*, 24 (2013), 327–350, quotes from p. 327.

105 See, for instance, the following: Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*. Patterson, *Dark Strangers*. Patterson, *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain*. J.A.G. Griffith, *et. al.*, eds., *Coloured Immigrants in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1960). Sydney Collins, *Coloured Minorities in Britain: Studies in British Race Relations based on African, West Indian and Asiatic Immigrants* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957). John Rex and Robert Moore, *Race, Community, and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1967).

106 See, for instance, Jacques Berlinerblau, *The Secular Bible: Why Nonbelievers Must Take Religion Seriously* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Steve Bruce, *Religion in Modern Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 53. David Martin, *On*

These are important details to hold in mind because they point to the differences in how individuals and groups live and articulate their so-called 'religious identity'. In addition, one must also pay attention to the intersections of 'religion' with other aspects of being, as well as the differences in how particular 'religious' groups and individuals perceive their relationships with each other and with external authorities, institutions, and individuals. For instance, Tariq Modood notes how being Muslim means different things to different people at different times; such as: community membership; heritage; precepts about justice, compassion, self and the afterlife; world-wide pan-Islamism; apolitical devotion; or devotion with 'secular' politics. Following from this, Modood underscores the political relevance of 'religion' since certain 'minorities' prefer to mobilise along 'religious' lines over that of 'ethnicity' or colour.¹⁰⁷

This is an important point because, ever since the 'Rushdie Affair', Muslims have been accused of not accepting or understanding the 'proper' boundaries of 'religion' and politics and therefore confusing and conflating the two. However, as George Moyser notes, we should be wary of making easy distinctions between 'religion' and politics since they are overlapping spheres in Britain. In this way, one can find evidence of Christian involvement in public issues both historically in the form of provision of welfare services, and more recently through involvement in, and public positions and pronouncements on, issues as varied as the nationalisation of industry, 'immigration', gambling, unemployment, fascism, cinema, literature, and, of course, 'race relations'. Furthermore, the values and institutions which displaced Christianity in Britain are so suffused with Christianity that it is often hard to differentiate Christian values from liberal secular humanistic ones, a tradition which is rooted in Christianity anyway. As such, because the Christian presence is not made explicit, it is often

Secularization: Towards a Revised General Theory (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), p. 174. Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (Chichester: Columbia University Press, 1975, repr. 1988), pp. 147–205. Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 13–14. Brian G. Armstrong, 'Calvin, John', in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2nd Edition, Vol. 3, ed. by Lindsay Jones (Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2005), pp. 1374–1377 (p. 1376). John Wolff, "'And there's another country...': religion, the state and British Identities", in *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945. Vol.2, Issues*, ed. by Gerald Parsons (London: Routledge / Open University, 1994), pp. 82–121 (pp. 94–95, 99). George Moyser, 'The Church of England and Politics: Patterns and Trends', in *Church and Politics Today*, ed. By Moyser, pp. 1–24 (pp. 6–7, 17–18).

107 Tariq Modood, *Still Not Easy Being British: Struggles for a Multicultural Citizenship* (Stoke on Trent: Trentham, 2010), pp. 3, 9.

underestimated.¹⁰⁸ This is a position also taken by Harry Goulbourne who notes that the 'Rushdie Affair' gave British Muslims a chance to 'articulate their grievances against their perceived and actual treatment within a society which at one level postulates that it is secular, and at another level is deeply Christian in traditions, institutions and social practices'.¹⁰⁹

The term 'religion' has been problematised since within the academic discipline of the Study of Religions (or Religious Studies), there are in fact lively debates about the cross-cultural analytical viability of the category or concept of 'religion'. Scholars have produced important work showing the historical construction of the category and its relationship with Christianity and Europe. These scholars have linked the formation of the category 'religion' variously to the fragmentation of the Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, to European colonialism and the 'discovery' of new cultures and peoples, as well as to power. However, despite the problems generated by assuming a cross-culturally viable definition of 'religion', it is also true to say that 'religion' exists in England as a category which accurately describes *juridical* and *cultural* distinctions made in the UK more generally. Still though, it is important to analyse 'religion' as an ideological category and to interrogate how and why it is used, in what contexts, and with what meaning/s attached.¹¹⁰

Timothy Fitzgerald has argued for the reconceptualisation of 'religion' as an aspect of culture, rather than as a *sui generis* entity in its own right.¹¹¹ This is a

108 Tariq Modood, 'British Asian Muslims and the Rushdie Affair,' *The Political Quarterly* (1992), 143–160 (p. 152). See also, Talal Asad, 'Multiculturalism and British Identity in the Wake of the Rushdie Affair', in *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*, by Talal Asad (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 239–268 (pp. 245–248). Frank Prochaska, *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain: The Disinherited Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 10–24. Machin, *Churches and Social Issues*, pp. 142–148, 156–167, 170–172, 175–210. Moyser, 'The Church of England and Politics', pp. 5, 17–18. See also the references given in n. 106.

109 Goulbourne, *Race Relations in Britain*, p. 66.

110 Timothy Fitzgerald, *Discourse on Civility and Barbarity: A Critical History of Religion and Related Categories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, pp. 147–205. Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), pp. 1–29. Jonathan Z. Smith, 'Religion, Religions, Religious', in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. by Mark C. Taylor (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 269–284. Talal Asad, 'The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category', in *Genealogies of Religion*, by Asad, pp. 27–54. Timothy Fitzgerald, *The Ideology of Religious Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 4–5, 54–118.

111 The social historian E.P. Thompson also conceptualised 'religion' along these lines. See the following for a discussion: Stephen Heathorn, 'E.P. Thompson, Methodism, and the "Culturalist" Approach to the Historical Study of Religion', *Method & Theory in the Study of*

position that this thesis is very much in agreement with, even though it is acknowledged that culture is itself a complicated and contested term.¹¹² Using culture in a broadly anthropological sense as the collected practises of everyday life, Christianity can be seen to occupy an important space within the histories and cultures of England. Christian people, as do Muslim, Hindu, Jewish, Jain, and Sikh people (etc.), occupy spaces within the complicated patchwork of English society and institutions. They work, shop, dine, dance, socialise, and generally exist according to their interests. As such, excluding their experiences and views from general cultural or social histories is both alienating and unrepresentative of the nation proper.

Viewing Christianity as a force within the cultures of England reminds one that people's awarenesses (including one's own) contributes to, and is mediated by, the cultural (and therefore also the 'religious') and social life in which they occur.¹¹³ For, as Stuart Hall reminds us, 'We all write and speak from a particular place and time, from a history and culture which is specific'. Indeed, our cultural identities are constructed and have histories, and belong both to the future and the past; as such, there is always a politics of place. Hall notes the movement, flux, and the transformations of culture, and asserts that our cultural identity is the the name 'we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past'.¹¹⁴ Christianity is one aspect of the cultures of England, both in the sixties and now, and has import and impact, irrespective of what one's own identity is. In agreement with Simon Green, one would then argue that social, cultural, intellectual, and political histories need to be factored into histories of 'religion' and vice versa.¹¹⁵

Despite all this, assertions that 'religion' in England or Britain has declined to the point of irrelevancy in the post-war period are abundant in more recent

Religion, 10 (1998), 210–226.

112 For an anthropological discussion of the term see: Clifford Geertz, 'Thick Description: Towards an Interpretive Theory of Culture', in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 3–30. Michel de Certeau produced two seminal texts on culture: *Culture in the Plural*, trans. by Tom Conley (London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); and *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. by Steven Rendall (London: University of California Press, 1988).

113 Valda Blundell, et. al., 'Editors' Introduction', in *Relocating Cultural Studies: Developments in theory and research* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 3–4

114 Stuart Hall, 'Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation,' *Framework*, 36 (1989), 68–82 (pp. 68–72, quote from p. 70).

115 Green, *The Passing of Protestant England*, p. 10.

literature. For instance, Callum Brown would find Christianity's most detrimental challenge to have been feminism and its restructuring of the female role.¹¹⁶ It should be noted that this so-called 'restructuring' is in essence a challenge to authority, and it precisely the relationship of the church in Britain to authority which scholars cite as a reason for its relative lack of social strength *vis-à-vis* churches in the USA.¹¹⁷ For Hugh McLeod, the 'decline' can be explained through four main themes: a significant increase in in the range of world-views accessible to people; increasing cultural pluralism; the lack of socialisation of children into Christianity; and the ecumenical movement and splits inside churches in the form of conservatives and radicals. In addition, the so-called 'decline of religion' has also been ascribed to the general cultural changes of the 1960s, post-war social changes, and steady generational decline.¹¹⁸

These varied reasons tend to be based in the widely accepted plummeting attendance statistics in the *historic majority-white churches* of Britain from the second half of the 1960s.¹¹⁹ However, not all scholars are agreed that attendance figures have declined rapidly since the 1960s.¹²⁰ Most notable is Robin Gill's *The Myth of the Empty Church* in which he problematises the post-war 'decline' assumption in four ways. Firstly, 'decline' in church attendance has

116 Callum G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 191–192. See also, Callum G. Brown, *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2006), pp. 13–14. This position is critiqued by Jane Garnett, *et. al.*: they state that mono-causal analysis cannot possibly describe society adequately. Furthermore, they note that feminist ideas slowly permeated society – there was no overnight revolution. Garnett, *et. al.*, 'Introduction', p. 5.

117 José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 29. Basil Mitchell, 'The Christian Conscience', in *The Oxford History of Christianity*, ed. by John McManners (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 618–643 (pp. 618–624). Bruce, *Religion in Modern Britain*, p. 47. Steve Bruce, *God is Dead: Secularization in the West* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 129–130. See also Hastings, *A History of English Christianity*, pp. 580–582.

118 McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s*, pp. 1–2. Brown, *Religion and Society*, pp. 224–277. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity*, pp. 580–586. Bruce, *Religion in Modern Britain*, pp. 29–30. Green, *The Passing of Protestant England*, pp. 305–315. Alasdair Crockett and David Voas, 'Generations of Decline: Religious Change in 20th-Century Britain,' *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45 (2006), 567–584.

119 See, for instance: Hastings, *A History of English Christianity*, p. 580. McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s*, p. 1. Crockett and Voas, 'Generations of Decline'.

120 Other scholars have questioned whether or not there were high levels of religiosity in Britain and Europe in earlier periods too. For instance, Talal Asad, José Casanova, and Roy Wallis and Steve Bruce question this in respect of the medieval period. Eric Hobsbawm states that in the mid-nineteenth century, most large cities and many mining areas in England were irreligious, and Alister Chapman notes a lack of religious practise in Derby in the first half of the twentieth-century. Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*, p. 39, n. 22. Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World*, pp. 15–17. Wallis and Bruce, 'Secularization', p. 24. E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Methodism and the Threat of Revolution in Britain', *History Today*, 7 (1957), 115–124 (p. 118). Chapman, 'Civil Religions', p. 9.

to be dated from the 1880s and not the post-war period. Secondly, if the secularisation thesis is correct and the rise of 'rational, scientific thought' has undermined 'religious belief', then the suburban, middle-class churches should have been affected first and the most, when in fact they were not. Thirdly, this does not explain why American church-going is so strong (although the authoritarian aspect noted above does). Fourthly, it is not that churches have become empty, but that 'competitive church building' resulted in too many churches in relation to the church going population. This is, perhaps, his most important point, and the emphasis on buildings at the expense of people was also something complained about by the Team Ministry, as will be shown in Chapter Two. In respect of this, Gill notes how Roman Catholics have consistently maintained full churches for the last 150 years, owing to the fact that they did not undertake this 'competitive church building'. In fact, he states that the Roman Catholics have never provided sufficient seating for their congregations in Britain, whereas, for example, the Anglicans have less attendances, but five times as many churches.¹²¹

The final challenge to the 'decline of religion' thesis is that it is based almost exclusively on a reading of the state of historical majority-white Christian churches, and fails to take seriously other forms of 'religion', including black-majority and black-led Christian churches. When non-Christian 'religions' are considered by historians and scholars of British 'religion', they are set apart in a separate chapter or sub-section and not included in the generalising decline narrative of the texts. This exclusionary tactic allows scholars to acknowledge that the 'religions' of black and Asian people are thriving and are representative of 'a sudden and very significant shift in the religious complexion of society', whilst at the same time positing them as exceptions to the 'rule' of decline and privatisation they are constructing.¹²² In this way, Asian and African 'religions' and black forms of Christianity are marginalised and set outside the boundaries of British or English 'religion' in much the same that people racialised as black

¹²¹ Robin Gill, *The Myth of the Empty Church* (London: SPCK, 1993), pp. 2–12. See also, Gerald Parsons, 'Introduction: Persistence, Pluralism and Perplexity', in *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945. Vol. 1, Traditions*, ed. by Gerald Parsons (London: Routledge / Open University, 1993), pp. 5–21 (pp. 13–14). Rupert Davies, 'Since 1932', in *A History of The Methodist Church in Great Britain: Volume Three*, ed. by Rupert Davies, A. Raymond George, and Gordon Rupp (London: Epworth Press, 1983), pp. 362–390 (pp. 364–365).

¹²² Brown, *Religion and Society*, pp. 291–292.

or Asian are placed outside the dominant British or English identity.¹²³

In these texts we can therefore find several problems: firstly, adherence to the notion of separate 'immigrant communities' which are somehow detached from British society at large. As such, the 'religion' of these 'immigrant communities' is therefore positioned as something fundamentally different from European, British, or English 'religion'. This position naturally enforces a distinction between 'us' and 'them', which is highly problematic, exclusionary, and historically deceptive. This is especially so when not all of these texts purport to be historically focused and, as such, many people considered to be part of an 'immigrant community' will have actually been born in the UK, as will their parents. Similarly, in the post-war context, many of these 'immigrant communities' will have been British citizens within a wider British context and as such, could have been given the space to re-articulate the meaning of 'British religion' rather than having been set aside and excluded from its very definition. Furthermore, since these scholars are operating on the assumption that there is a valid cross-cultural category of 'religion', their setting aside of 'religions' other than the historic majority-white churches does not make analytical sense. Either we are talking about the same phenomenon or we are not.¹²⁴

So if not the 'decline of religion' or Christianity more specifically, then what? In line with Jane Garnett *et. al.*, the argument advanced here is one of the transformation of Christianity and 'religion' in England and Britain more generally.¹²⁵ Transformation because society more broadly has undeniably transformed in the post-war period due to technology, migration, the mass

123 Brown, *Religion and Society*, pp. 253–258. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain*, p. 2. McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s*, pp. 119–122. Bruce, *Religion in Modern Britain*, pp. 73–94. Grace Davie, *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 1–26, 45–73.

124 Interestingly, this exclusionary tactic has also been noted by Satnam Virdee in respect of histories of the English working-class whereby 'minority presences' are mentioned as 'add-ons' and in such a way as to not disturb or 'fundamentally alter our long-established understanding of the key trends, episodes and events of English working class history'. Satnam Virdee, *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 2.

125 Garnett, *et. al.*, *Redefining Christian Britain*. Jane Garnett and Alana Harris, eds., *Rescripting Religion in the City: Migration and Religious Identity in the Modern Metropolis* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013). Older, but in this same vein: Gerald Parsons, ed., *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945. Vol. 1, Traditions* (London: Routledge / Open University, 1993). Gerald Parsons, ed., *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945. Vol.2, Issues* (London: Routledge / Open University, 1994). Terence Thomas, ed., *The British: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London: Routledge, 1988).

media, and so forth. It follows then, that as an aspect of society or culture, the 'religious' component has changed in line with, and by way of, the people who embody it.¹²⁶ Not only has migration brought a deeper complexity to the varieties of 'religious' experience in England, including the rise of black-led churches, but some white Christians, and especially white radical Christians of the sixties, sought to restate Christianity by engaging with the transformations English society was experiencing.

Sam Brewitt-Taylor has written on Anglican Christian radicals of the sixties and urged for an acknowledgement of the sincerity and passion of these people who believed 'that the modern world was standing on the cusp of a new era, a new epoch, a radical transformation in its existence, for which the traditional Christian gospel had to be completely restated'.¹²⁷ In respect of Methodism, this is certainly supported by the findings of this thesis as will be shown in the proceeding pages. Whilst not all Christians were involved in this radical restatement of Christianity – Christians obviously operated on various points of the political (and theological) spectrum like every other human being – those that did were just as concerned about their community's (i.e. their church's) relationship with society and justice as were the secular and Marxist radicals of the decade.

This thesis is then a thesis in two parts. Firstly, it seeks to look broadly at how various Christians engaged in the politics of 'race', (anti-)racism, and 'race relations' in the sixties. In this respect it examines the work of prominent Anglicans such as Archbishop Ramsey and Trevor Huddleston, as well as the wider ecumenical movement in the form of the WCC. Secondly, it is a micro-study of a radical Methodist Team Ministerial experiment in in Notting Hill. This duality is represented in the chapter structure which comprises of six main chapters which sit in three pairs of two. The pairs represent general chapters of scene setting in a particular field followed by specific examples of the Notting Hill Methodist Church (NHMC), as a way of broadening and then tightening focus. Additionally, this structure represents the three main institutions of the NHMC: the church itself, its social and political body the Notting Hill Social

126 To this end, Alister Chapman has recently written on religious change or transformation in Derby. See his 'Civil Religions in Derby'.

127 Brewitt-Taylor, "Christian Radicalism", pp. 33–35, quote from p. 35.

Council (NHSC), and the Ecumenical Centre. Finally, the structure represents the three main lines of communication which the church engaged in: communication with itself (the church community), communication with the local environment (Notting Hill), and communication with the wider world. In this way, the three chapters which are about the NHMC and its associated bodies also represent a steady broadening or unfurling of the communications of the church from itself outwards into the wider world.

In some ways, the journey taken through the archives – both in their living and traditional forms – in order to construct this story has been the complete opposite: a steady tightening or contraction of focus. The journey began during an interview with the radical black activist Sivanandan, in which he spoke of the 1969 WCC Consultation on White Racism. Listening to him speak of the Consultation as a transformative event for him as a radical and a non-Christian led to a trip to the archives of the WCC in Geneva to find out more. There, contained within those files and folders, was another name and place: Revd David Mason and the Notting Hill Methodist Church. The name stuck because amidst the constant paternalistic, liberal pleas and assertions of the myth of tolerance by English Christians, here was a voice with a different tenor. Here was a man saying an emphatic yes to the existence of racism and asking what more could be done to fight it. Back in London, it was possible to locate some of the records of the NHMC, the NHSC, and the Ecumenical Centre at the London Metropolitan Archives, but there was still a sense that it was not enough: here were some 'facts', but what of the emotional content? How could it be determined if this historian had the tone right? By now it was clear that here was a radical, *different*, and interesting experiment and it seemed important to bring it fully to light and to do it justice. As such, the NHMC was contacted in order to try to locate further archives. From here, following a path well lit by generosity, it was possible to interview Mason, two other prominent members of the church – Stephen Duckworth and Brian Frost – view some of the papers of the NHSC held by its successor organisation the Kensington and Chelsea Social Council, and spend a day rooting around happily in the church's attic through piles of papers and pictures of the past.

So there is the path to the micro-study, but what of the larger, broader picture of

'race' and 'race relations' in which it was necessary to situate and contextualise the story of the NHMC? Alongside the journey above, visits to other archives, Christian and otherwise, were being made which allowed for the broader story to emerge in a connect-the-dots fashion. A visit to the Student Christian Movement archives as a site of radical Christianity turned out to house some papers on the Free University for Black Studies of Notting Hill which was funded by the WCC and assisted, in moments, by Mason, the NHSC, and another prominent Methodist, David Head. A brief visit to the Enoch Powell archives in Stafford at a similar time to a visit to the Ramsey papers at Lambeth Palace led to shock over the difference in the contents of their postbags. This begged the question as to whether Trevor Huddleston too received such letters of abuse and thus, another connective line was drawn. As well as this, brief visits to other archives were made to try to find traces of specific voices: the Donald Chesworth papers at Queen Mary, the Black Cultural Archives for an interview with Wilfred Wood, and the municipal records of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea for the voices of Notting Hill itself. In the end, the rich variety of sources used has allowed for a detailed and textured narrative to emerge as conversations, causes, actions, and effects were constructed between, and emerged from, the different archival spaces.

This journey through the archives came then, in the end, to be written thusly. Chapter One broadly examines how Christians approached 'race' and 'race relations' throughout the sixties. As well as an analysis of texts produced, this chapter includes a juxtaposition of the position of Archbishop Ramsey with that of Trevor Huddleston which serves to highlight the poles of Christian opinion in respect of broadly *positive* stances on, and engagement with, *English* 'race relations'. Alongside this is an examination of the changing position on 'race relations' of the wider ecumenical movement in the form of the WCC. In conjunction with this, Chapter Two is an examination of how the NHMC in particular approached 'race relations' and racialised issues within the church community. Chapter Three examines the high levels of community action in Notting Hill in that decade, with a focus on 'race relations' bodies and racialised aspects of housing activism. This is a scene setting chapter to contextualise the NHSC's community activism as detailed in Chapter Four, again with a focus on the racialised aspects of their work. Chapter Five analyses articulations of

English racism as found in letters sent to the Archbishop Ramsey and Trevor Huddleston throughout the sixties. Chapter Six details an international Consultation on White Racism organised by the WCC which was held in the Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre in 1969. The final chapter pairing gives examples of what kinds of racism existed in England in the sixties, and couples that with what kind of stances the churches collectively took on the issue by the end of the decade, as well as the Consultation's effect on Notting Hill.

The 1969 WCC Consultation represents a moment of radicalism within the Christian churches which has perhaps never again been equalled. Alongside the moment of white violence in 1958, it thus bookends the thesis by way of showing how far some white Christians had come in their engagement with 'race'. Christians generally began the decade working in, and through, the field of 'race relations', but some ended it with a focus on the force which animated it: white racism. There is then a century of difference between 1958 and 1969 and in this difference we find a sixties much longer in spaciality than it was in temporality. We find the first tentative shift towards this new way of working and engaging and speaking emerging in 1964, a year significant for the emergence of a radical, challenging blackness which spoke truth to power and in its frustration demanded to be heard.¹²⁸ Writing in a moment fifty years later, these voices of radical black Englishness or Britishness are still finding the discrepancies Sivanandan alerted us to between the values as preached and the values as practised. They still speak, and the question remains how long it will take for society, locally and globally, to listen. However, it can be said that over the course of five days in Notting Hill in May 1969, these voices were finally truly *heard* by a global body of Christians, and a programme of action thus embarked on.

128 Waters, 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness', pp. 8–15. It is also famous for the racist campaign by Peter Griffiths in Smethwick in the election of that year. It was also the year that the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD) was formed. See: Joe Street, 'Malcolm X, Smethwick, and the Influence of the African American Freedom Struggle on British Race Relations in the 1960s', *Journal of Black Studies*, 38 (2008), 932–950. Benjamin W. Heineman, Jr, *The Politics of the Powerless: A Study of the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1972), p. 1.

Chapter One: English Christians and 'Race Relations'

The standard narrative of white Christians and 'race relations' constructs a cold, disinterested, and unengaged English Christian body. Whilst this is certainly true in some respects, a closer look – especially in places other than the Anglican community – finds that white Christians did in fact engage with the politics of 'race', 'race relations', and 'immigration' throughout the sixties to varying degrees and in differing ways. For instance, *The Methodist Recorder* published several articles which dealt with 'race' and 'immigration'.¹²⁹ To focus briefly on this newspaper, in response to the white violence of September 1958 it published a front page leader which noted how the events in Nottingham and Notting Hill had burst the nation's smugness which had typically pointed to the USA and South Africa as sites of racism rather than itself. The article also poked small holes in the myth of tolerance by stating that, 'We pride ourselves, on very slender evidence, on our tolerance, but we mistrust the man who does think in a different way'. The article also sought to 'explain' the black presence by way of invitations to work, criticised colonial and missionary paternalistic legacies in common stereotypes of black people, and called upon its readers to remember that all humans were of 'one blood'.¹³⁰

The Methodist Recorder continued reporting on racialised issues throughout the sixties. Examples would be concerns over the fact that it was impossible to get black and white people mixing socially in Notting Hill and situating the 1958 racialised violence in similar outbreaks in the area two years before. Alongside this were positive reports on the growth of black-led Pentecostal churches in Birmingham and suggestions of acquiring a language specialist so that greater interactions with Birmingham Pakistani people could be had.¹³¹ Without claiming to be a thorough or complete analysis of *The Recorder's* tone and content, it is true to say that 'race' and 'immigration' in the British or English context featured repeatedly in their pages in differing ways, but in ways which were *generally*

129 The Anglican *Church Times* gave considerably less space than *The Methodist Recorder* to issues of 'race' and 'immigration', and was also considerably less progressive in the coverage it did give.

130 'Church and Colour. "We Must Show What Family Means". Urgent Need for Unpatronising Friendship', *Methodist Recorder*, 25 September 1958, p. 1.

131 'Two Worlds of Notting Hill. The Biggest Barrier is Hard Fact of Social Aloofness', *Methodist Recorder*, 4 June 1959, p. 1. 'Colour: Birmingham Can Report Progress. Churches Playing Notable Part', *Methodist Recorder*, 28 July 1960, p. 2.

sympathetic to the points of views of black migrants.¹³² For instance, they reported on feelings of alienation on the part of black Christians in 1961, and reminded readers that racism was still 'strong and widespread' in 1967.¹³³ As well as reporting on a Methodist 'race relations' conference in 1966, there were, of course, reports on the various localised projects undertaken by particular churches which were attempting to reach out to 'immigrant groups', including the experiment of the Notting Hill Team Ministry.¹³⁴

The Recorder also carried a number of articles which spoke out against the two Commonwealth Immigration Acts of the decade. The 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act was condemned as racist and one article stated that if Methodists did not protest against it, their heritage was at stake.¹³⁵ Similarly, there were criticisms of the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act which was called 'a concession to racialism'.¹³⁶ In the words of Pauline Webb, a prominent Methodist laywoman, Methodists should have been resisting with all their strength 'any kind of legislation that would decide who can live in our country solely on the grounds of what is the colour of their skin, or the skin of their parents or grandparents'.¹³⁷ However, perhaps the most surprising and thoughtful of the articles surveyed was published towards the end of 1961 and was a gentle critique of the impending 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act. Much as in the style of Kitagawa's 1962 document discussed in the introduction, the author Revd Douglas Thompson here posed a series of questions in respect of various aspects of the forthcoming Act. For instance, in respect of

132 As with the *Church Times*, there were also reports about the US, South Africa, and the Commonwealth, but these reports are not the subject of this thesis.

133 'West Indians Tolerated but Not Accepted. Westhill Survey in Birmingham', *Methodist Recorder*, 7 September 1961, p. 4. 'Race problem still with us', *Methodist Recorder*, 4 May 1967, p. 2.

134 For example: 'The Notting Hill Experiment: Formation of Team Ministry', *Methodist Recorder*, 25 May 1961, p. 3. 'Church Not Idle in "Rachman-Land". Paddington Caring Ministry. Leaven of Normality Amid Tumult', *Methodist Recorder*, 8 August 1963, p. 1. (n.b.: That article is about the Fernhead Road Methodist Church, not the NHMC.) 'Team-Ministry for Today's Needs', *Methodist Recorder*, 13 February 1964, p. 3. 'The Gospel, in 20th Century Terms, for Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 7 July 1964, p. 7. 'Serving the Immigrant in South London', *Methodist Recorder*, 26 November 1964, p. 4. 'West Indians Are Fully Integrated at Roscoe Place. Coloured Children Now Have Yorkshire Accents', *Methodist Recorder*, 6 October 1966, p. 6. 'Race Relations Theme for Guilders and Young Adults', *Methodist Recorder*, 21 July 1966, p. 7.

135 George Thomas, 'Viewpoint: Our Heritage at Stake', *Methodist Recorder*, 23 November 1961, p. 2.

136 'Immigration Bill: Read the small print', *Methodist Recorder*, 28 February 1968, p. 2.

137 'Pauline Webb denounces "skin game": Let's lose that "Britain ends at Dover" mentality', *Methodist Recorder*, 7 March 1968, p. 1.

suggestions to bar people with a criminal record, Thompson noted that criminal laws varied from country to country and pointed out that 'To leap the Berlin wall is called a criminal act in some places'. In respect of the proposed health tests, Thompson noted how much easier it was for people with long associations with family doctors to obtain one *vis-à-vis* someone who had worked on a sugar plantation all their life. Finally, in respect of the employment voucher system he asked if anyone would 'give consideration to the similarity in this process to the old system of indentured labour which has such sombre memories for West Indians? Has the Government a capable historian around? He might find useful guides in the Mission House archives'.¹³⁸

It is clear then that some white Christians were thinking, speaking, and reading about English 'race relations' in this decade. In the Institute of Race Relations' *Colour and Citizenship* report, Rose *et. al.* noted that the churches had four main lines of activity in the 'race relations' field: national pronouncements made by leading church figures and organisations, educational work, activities by church institutions, and individual work by ministers at the parish level. Whilst the public pronouncements of more senior white Christian figures and national editorial lines were not necessarily indicative of the actual practises of the white laity and clergy more generally, it does seem important to look more closely at what kinds of statements were made by these more senior, or leading, figures and organisations. This is especially so given that they were considered one of the four main lines of engagement by social scientists at that time.¹³⁹

With this in mind, alongside the more generally known, and celebrated, anti-racist stance of Trevor Huddleston, the decade also found the Archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey chairing the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI), and witnessed the World Council of Churches (WCC) transform from an organisation which issued multiple evolving *statements* on racial discrimination, to one which openly condemned *white* racism and one which advocated and enacted *active support* of black liberation movements. Despite the fact that the WCC is obviously not a specifically

138 Rev Douglas W. Thompson, "'Curb" on Immigration. Things that Want Close Scrutiny', *Methodist Recorder*, 19 October 1961, p. 3.

139 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 370–372. However, this is also not to suggest that words are enough: rather, they are simply part of a wholistic oppositional stance to injustice. To this end, the localised actions of a particular church are the subject of Chapters Two, Four, and Six.

English organisation, as the main organisational representative of the ecumenical movement it is important to examine where it stood on this issue for three main reasons. Firstly for the influence it had on English Christians, secondly because Archbishop Ramsey was one of the WCC's five presidents, and thirdly to contextualise its 1969 Consultation on White Racism which is examined in Chapter Six.¹⁴⁰ Alongside the statements and interventions of the above people and organisations, various other Christians in England also wrote and published books on 'race' and 'race relations'. These texts also serve as a valuable guide to the perspectives which prevailed over the course of the decade.

It is important to understand more generally the broadly positive ways in which white Christians and white-led Christian organisations understood and approached 'race', 'race relations', and racism in the sixties so that there is a context within which to place the more specific story of the Notting Hill Methodist Church and its associated bodies. Moreover, these publications, larger ecumenical bodies, and more prominent and influential figures will have helped set the framework within which Christians would have processed, (re)produced, and/or understood 'race', 'race relations', and racism. As such, what follows is an examination of certain literatures produced by (predominantly, but not solely) white British Christians, and also an examination of the positions, statements, and actions of Archbishop Ramsey, Trevor Huddleston, and the WCC. One final point of note is that, outwith the interventions and actions of Trevor Huddleston and Archbishop Ramsey, these conversations were mainly held within, and directed towards, the Christian community.

Christian Texts on 'Race' and 'Race Relations'

Overall, there was not a flurry of books produced during the sixties. Therefore, when one considers the extent of the media and general public interest in 'immigration' and 'race', this lack does lend some credence to the summation that *overall*, the churches were weak in their responses to black British migration.¹⁴¹ For whilst we have seen that white Christians did speak on the

140 Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', p. 295.

141 Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', p. 214. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', p. 194.

issue as individuals and in shorter newspaper articles, what we find missing is an abundance of *sustained* analysis through a Christian gaze. However, this is not to say that no attempt was made; therefore eight books and pamphlets produced by (again, mainly but not solely) white English Christians for a Christian audience have been selected for review below. Those included are not an exhaustive list, but they are a fair representation of the works written. An examination of the literatures produced helps the reader see the evolution of 'official' or normative Christian viewpoints on 'race' and 'race relations'. For, whilst they were clearly produced by elites, they were designed to be educative in a wider sense for the general English (and British) Christian public.

All of these texts can, in some sense, trace their lineage back to J.H. Oldham's *Christianity and the Race Problem*, which was published in 1924 and is considered the foundational text of this field. Whilst it was published outwith the period concerned, a brief note will be made on it. The text is interesting since many of its themes were echoed throughout the sixties to various degrees and with various levels of volume. The book rooted the 'race problem' in European expansion, and saw 'race' as the fundamental dividing line of the world. Oldham was at pains to discount the idea of 'race' from an individual and scientific point point of view, but at the same time, he left it intact from a cultural or 'civilisational' standpoint. A standpoint which posited European culture(s) as superior, Asian cultures as meritorious, and African cultures as non-existent. Oldham's book reflected a grappling of Christianity in respect of social matters and he sought to counter claims that Christianity was not able to deal with these kinds of 'real world' issues by way of positioning the universality of Christianity as a unifying and racially transcendent force.¹⁴²

This first text of our period selected for review is a small pamphlet entitled *Your Neighbour from the West Indies*. It was published in 1958 by the British Council of Churches (BCC) for a white Christian audience and took a paternalistic, patronising, and educative tone.¹⁴³ For instance, the authors of the pamphlet reminded the reader of how nice it was to be greeted by friends when abroad, with the moral being to treat Caribbean people well for this reason. Caribbean

142 J.H. Oldham, *Christianity and the Race Problem* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1924), pp. 1–29, 46–62, 94–125, 248–265.

143 At this time, it was believed that racial tension could be solved by educating white people on the ways of black people. See, for instance, Hill, *Black and White in Harmony*, p. 7.

people (or 'West Indians' in the parlance of the time) were also 'explained' to the white reader in a deeply paternalistic fashion: family patterns as a product of slavery, any perceived laziness being due to bad nutrition from low pay, and the perceived fuller relationship with emotions as being due to limited educational and cultural opportunities which had allegedly led to less balanced intellectual interests.¹⁴⁴

At this juncture, and in this text, the Caribbean presence in Britain was rooted in Empire but it was seen as a temporary phenomenon. Therefore, the relationship was constructed as a new possibility for mission so that Caribbean people could return home with a feeling of the oneness of the church and a love of Britain. The articulated ideas displaying white superiority and white ignorance were also rooted in Empire, and show a marked difference in how Empire was viewed when compared to the end of the sixties. The pamphlet said, 'We have some glow of pride in the splashes of red scattered about the map of the world, but have been woefully ignorant of the people living in various parts of the Commonwealth. Many have absorbed the oft-preached doctrine of the superiority of the white races which has crept into our vocabulary in verbal symbols'. In this way the writer considered 'immigration' to be a way of offering white people the chance to learn about Caribbean people alongside 'their' learning of 'us'.¹⁴⁵

In the same year, the Student Christian Movement (SCM) published a booklet by John V. Taylor called *Black and White* as part of their 'Thinking Things Through' series of discussion books for young (white) people.¹⁴⁶ The booklet presented the possibility that the white reader had a 'West Indian' or African neighbour, and asked the reader to consider questions such as the differences between black and white people, could black and white people get on, and what would happen if a white *girl* wanted to marry a black *man*? The booklet was divided into four parts with a set of discussion questions at the end of each part. The first section introduced a white family (the intended audience) with a new black neighbour called Michael. The white family consisted of racist parents –

144 British Council of Churches (BCC), *Your Neighbour from the West Indies* (London: British Council of Churches, 1958).

145 *Ibid.*, quote from p. 7.

146 John V. Taylor was an Anglican missionary who had spent time in Africa, and later became Bishop of Winchester.

'you can't trust a black man the same as you would a white man'; 'The black races are the most primitive; their brains are smaller than ours'; 'you can't ever be sure of a man with black blood in his veins' – a mainly curious and invisible son, and a liberal daughter, Sheila. 'What right have you got to call us white ones "ordinary people"? There are far more coloured people in the world than there are white. *We are the queer ones, if anybody is*', Sheila said.¹⁴⁷

Michael was a Jamaican mechanic whose relationship to Britain was underscored by his British passport and citizenship, his pride in the Commonwealth, by having the same Queen as 'us', his knowledge of England from his school days, and that English was his mother-tongue. The reader was walked through his experiences in Britain: shock at the existence of the white working-class, the realisation of his blackness through the white gaze, enforced segregated housing due to the racism of whites, and the subsequent bitterness in terms of how whites had come to be seen by his black house-mates. The section ended with Michael determined to find out if the English were 'as bad as all that', and he eventually found himself a room in a white lodging house, hence becoming the neighbour of Sheila and her family. The discussion questions asked the reader to consider how much of Sheila's parents' point of view were true, and why and how streets became 'coloured quarters'.¹⁴⁸

After being lulled into a false sense of liberalism, the second section greets the reader with some jarring sexism: Sheila's dressmaking class at the local polytechnic had been unexpectedly cancelled, and so she slipped into the back of a biology class where a teacher was explaining things so simply that Sheila found, to her surprise, that even *she* could understand. Afterwards, she went and asked questions of the teacher who, using some dubious form of 'racial science' – 'Don't use the word "race" [...]. Scientists prefer to use the word "stock"' – gave her 'scientific' reasons as to why all the things her parents said were wrong.¹⁴⁹ Here, just as 'race' becomes 'ethnicity' in more modern language (or 'culture' in the Oldham text cited above), we find an example of how the container of 'race', rather than being dismantled, gets emptied into another:

147 John V. Taylor, *Black and White* (London: SCM Press, 1958, repr. 1964), pp. 3–4, *emphasis in original text*.

148 *Ibid.*, pp. 3–9.

149 *Ibid.*, pp. 10–17, quote from p. 15.

stock.¹⁵⁰ This is a common tactic deployed when the uncomfortable meanings and associations of particular words 'leak' and are no longer contained by the original term. Euphemisms are therefore invented in an attempt to control and re-contain meaning and difference in a more 'comfortable' fashion.¹⁵¹

This usage of euphemisms was continued into the next chapter wherein a learned African-American scholar and friend of Michael, Dr. Ackerman, told Sheila that prejudice wasn't usually prejudice but actually superstition (there is no mention of racism or 'racialism'). By this juncture in the story, Sheila and her white chaperone-boyfriend Jimmy had made friends with Michael and were eating dinner at Michael's house. Dr. Ackerman explained several different ways in which superstition manifested and then gave 'the three signs of prejudice': racialising a story for no reason, criticisms without evidence, and saying 'all' when a person meant 'some' (or 'one'). The discussion section at the end asked the reader which statements of Sheila's parents were scientifically untrue and which showed prejudice; and also asked the reader to take cuttings from the newspaper which showed evidence of prejudice.¹⁵²

Whereas the first three sections displayed a fairly broad-minded liberalism in highlighting white racism, the final chapter continued the strong vein of sexism and revealed the boundaries of the liberal agenda: the impossibility of a white woman marrying a black man. This taboo was fortified both by Sheila's father forbidding it from a racist perspective and Michael from a liberal point of view. Michael told Sheila that marriage was too difficult as it was to add the extra difficulty of colour or nationality to the mix. Besides, the world was too unjust for the children of such unions who were neither accepted by white or black people.¹⁵³ It is, of course, significant that the author/s chose a black character to

150 Wilfred Wood and John Downing comment on this in terms of the similarities between arguments in respect of 'racial propensity' and that of 'cultural patterns'. Wood and Downing, *Vicious Circle*, p. 46 n. 1. More recently, the following scholars have remarked on this in respect of 'race' into 'ethnicity': Lewis and Phoenix, "Race", "ethnicity" and identity', p. 124. Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, pp. 14–15. Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black*, p. 68. Simon Clarke and Steve Garner, *White Identities: A Critical Sociological Approach* (London: Pluto Press, 2010), p. 90.

151 Valerie Sinason, 'The Psycholinguistics of Discrimination', in *Crises of the Self: Further Essays on Psychoanalysis and Politics*, ed. by Barry Richards (London: Free Association Books, 1989), pp. 217–227. Stanley Cohen calls the use of euphemism 'interpretative denial'. See his *States of Denial: Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001, repr. 2006), pp. 7–9.

152 Taylor, *Black and White*, pp. 18–25.

153 *Ibid.*, pp. 28–31. This viewpoint was also in: Oldham, *Christianity and the Race Problem*, pp. 145–158. Hill, *Black and White in Harmony*, pp. 83–84, 114–118.

reinforce the father's racist point of view as it allowed for a deferral of responsibility: *they* want to self-segregate, *they* reject 'race mixing'. These sexist and racist fears of 'blood-mingling' remind one of James Baldwin's comment three years earlier. He said that whilst liberal whites claimed they did not believe in the biological or mental inferiority of black people, that did not mean that black people were free to eat at their table nor marry their daughters or sisters.¹⁵⁴

The next booklet under consideration is a 1960 Church of England publication entitled *Together in Britain*. Given that this booklet was published only two years after the above two titles, there are some marked differences in tone and content. Although it also grappled with the idea of 'race' in a confused fashion, both disavowing it as commonly understood by the public but also confirming that it existed in scientific ways, the booklet also made reference to the social processes of racialisation, albeit without using that word.¹⁵⁵ One wonders if the more nuanced understandings of the processes of racialisation were due to the presence of Rev Canon J.J. Hay in the working group which produced the text. Canon Hay was a Jamaican priest who took over the position of Chaplain to West Indians from Revd Ronald Campbell in September 1959.¹⁵⁶ Noting that good-will alone could not counter so-called scientific 'facts' about 'race', the book constructed a theology of 'race relations' which was grounded in Christian ideas of reconciliation and neighbourliness. Stressing the oneness of all – separation and strife being a product of sin – and the importance of intent in treating one's neighbour as one would like to be treated, the authors noted that 'reconciliation is impossible unless men are seen as God sees them, and this recognition *may have to be fought for*. The church must recognize this, and may not evade truth in order to circumvent strife'.¹⁵⁷ This willingness to endure strife in order to obtain justice is strikingly different from the emphases on harmony which generally obtained at that time.

154 James Baldwin, 'Many Thousands Gone', in *Notes of a Native Son*, by James Baldwin (New York: Bantam, 1955, repr. 1964), pp. 18–36 (pp. 19–20).

155 *Together in Britain: A Christian Handbook on Race Relations* (London: Church Assembly Board for Social Responsibility, 1960), pp. 4–12. Kenan Malik has also made somewhat similar arguments more recently in, *Strange Fruit: Why Both Sides Are Wrong in the Race Debate* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2008), pp. 13–36.

156 He returned to Jamaica in 1962. 'Second Jamaican Priest for Work Among Migrants', *Church Times*, 18 September 1959, p. 1. 'Canon Ends His Ministry Among West Indians', *Church Times*, 26 October 1962, p. 19.

157 *Together in Britain*, pp. 13–19, quote from p. 18, *emphasis mine*.

This text also saw the beginning of some forms of self-criticism of Christianity, the churches, and white people. It reminded the reader that the 'coloured problems' in the 'mixed' areas of the world – for instance Indians in Africa and Africans in the Caribbean – were mainly of the white man's making. Furthermore, the authors also underscored the importance of holding in mind that, alongside crediting Christians with working towards the abolition of slavery, Christians were simultaneously largely responsible for the false images of Africans in particular, and negative opinions of people in colour in general, which existed in Britain at that time. They clarified that, 'although the Church in Britain has long discarded the attitude to race relations which was engendered by the primitive view of African culture on the one hand and by the growth of the idea of imperial vocation on the other, traces of it remain in the reactions of not a few Christians'.¹⁵⁸

The authors also highlighted how solidarity work between disparate non-white groups was due to the hostile environment created by whites: the only thing which united the staggering heterogeneity of different groups was, 'their (qualified) rejection as ordinary citizens by the majority'. Again referencing the legacies of Empire, they rooted 'anti-colour' feeling in the long history of colonialism, and noted that the dissolution of Empire had caused some white people to become 'disgruntled and resentful'.¹⁵⁹ Similarly, concerns over the 'special treatment' of black people were also referenced in that it was felt any 'special treatment' would result in a group with a vested interest in maintaining its integrity, and one presumes, privileges. Seemingly refusing to take a position on this, they also conversely noted that the problems black people faced were so acute that it warranted special treatment. To this end, and five years before the first Race Relations Act, the authors advocated a law outlawing discrimination in housing, employment, and places of enjoyment.¹⁶⁰

Clearly the reality of various racialised group identities in Britain was (and is) a situation which people struggled to come to terms with in a coherent manner. For whilst on the one hand the authors stated that some people drew lines around themselves – they singled out Muslims and Hindus in particular – they

158 *Together in Britain*, pp. 20–26, quote from p. 26.

159 See the letters discussed in Chapter Five for some examples of this.

160 *Together in Britain*, pp. 26–28, quote from p. 26.

also noted that the presence of black people only offered a challenge to the rights and interests of others *if* they were defined as outsiders in the first place. Therefore, it was white people who determined that black people caused conflict by the very fact of looking on them as fundamentally alien to start with.¹⁶¹ Whilst there is an obvious sense of irony here since they are both problematising and constructing boundaries, this was nevertheless a fairly progressive position to take, if only in part. They stated,

Once a 'coloured' group is defined as an entity 'not of us', then conflict can occur over things which are scarce: jobs, houses and so on. Such a conflict will then appear to be very realistic, for groups will be seen to contend over important things. In the final analysis, however, the conflict rests on the definition made by the majority of who belongs and who does not.¹⁶²

In the final chapter, the authors gave recommendations for Christian action. Aside from exhortations to neighbourliness and a constant holding onto the idea of reconciliation as outlined above, the authors pointed out that Christian parents can 'make or mar' the 'race relations' of the future by how they raised their children. The authors asked parents to consider the representations of black people in the newspapers and journals they read, and pointed out the influences that Christians could have in their wider communities, such as in trade unions, workplaces, and voluntary organisations. They highlighted the subtle ways in which discrimination worked, and cautioned against the assumption that the absence of overt discrimination was the objective to aim for. Indeed, they said that just because relationships between white and black were no longer governed by colonial codes, that did not mean that the white man's claims to superiority had been abandoned, since substantial discrimination remained in many areas. They called for demonstrations *and* practical action which 'must be realistic. And realism involves the recognition that the reconciliation of racial conflicts is demanding and costly'. With this kind of sentiment, one can see their hope that Britain could work out solutions to questions considered insoluble elsewhere in the world.¹⁶³

Revd Clifford Hill was a Congregationalist minister working in Tottenham who wrote widely on Caribbean people and the churches from the late fifties and two

161 *Together in Britain*, pp. 29–31.

162 *Ibid.*, pp. 31–32.

163 *Ibid.*, pp. 32–45, quote from p. 45.

of his texts will be briefly discussed here.¹⁶⁴ His first book, *Black and White in Harmony* was another explanatory text for white people which discussed 'West Indian' sexual morals, employment and housing problems, integration into his church, and so forth. As was typical of the late fifties, the text is deeply paternalistic and patronising in tone, although it is also clear that the author 'meant well' in a genuine way.¹⁶⁵ As Edson Burton has noted, the emphasis on harmony was typical of the fifties and it was felt that the churches in general had a strong and vital role to play in terms of helping to create 'harmony' between black and white citizens in order to achieve the 'social absorption' of black migrants in an assimilative sense.¹⁶⁶

Hill's 1963 *West Indian Migrants and the London Churches* was an attempt to understand more fully why many Caribbean people had stopped practising Christianity once in London, as well as seeking to discover what the London churches were doing to 'integrate' Caribbean people into the life of particular church communities. The book was based on a survey sent out to every London church which was designed to reveal 'the effects the migration to Britain has had upon the church-going habits and the religious life of West Indians'.¹⁶⁷ The results led him to state that most London churches were doing a dismal job of 'integrating' Caribbean migrants for a variety of reasons. However, and again typical of the first half of the sixties, whilst he acknowledged the racism (or 'prejudice') of white people at various moments – for instance in terms of the formation of 'ghettos' and by way of putting the onus for the eradication of prejudice and the construction of 'harmonious race relations' on young people – Hill refused to engage with it in a sustained fashion. A discussion of prejudice, he said, was outwith the scope of the book.¹⁶⁸ This oblique kind of acknowledgement is a part of the myth of tolerance and was evidenced in much of the white liberal comments seen in the last chapter. It is an acknowledgement

164 Another author writing at the same time and with a similar emphasis was Malcolm J.C. Calley, *God's People: West Indian Pentecostal Sects in England* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1965). This text will not be discussed here for reasons of space. Clifford Hill's other texts from this period are: *Black Churches*; 'From Church to Sect'; and, 'Pentecostalist Growth'.

165 Hill, *Black and White in Harmony*.

166 Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', p. 324.

167 Hill, *West Indian Migrants*, pp. 8–10, quote from p. 8. Churches of the following denominations received a copy of the survey: Anglican, Baptist, Methodist, Congregational, Roman Catholic, and Presbyterian.

168 *Ibid.*, pp. 29–38, 49, 76–77.

of racism which does not seek to elevate it, but rather buries it as less meaningful than it is.

The next book under consideration is *Race: A Christian Symposium* which was published in 1968. With endorsements by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Roman Catholic Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, this book declared itself to be the first major ecumenical work on 'race' to appear in Britain. It was edited by David Mathews, Director of the Catholic Overseas Appointments which was part of the Catholic Institute for International Relations, and Revd Clifford Hill. The book featured chapters by prominent Christian professionals such as Philip Mason (then Director of the Institute of Race Relations), Sheila Patterson (academic), and Adrian Hastings (Roman Catholic priest and historian). The chapters considered 'race' and 'race relations' from a variety of perspectives such as: the globalised aspects of migration, the biology of 'race', the theology of 'race', and Christian views on 'intermarriage'; as well as essays on Britain from the perspectives of Christians from Africa, the Caribbean, and India. These essays were included in order to show that white Christians were as much in need of addressing their prejudices as any other white British group.¹⁶⁹

The introductory chapter by Mathews noted that there had been a big change in how 'race' was approached by opinion makers in the preceding decade: it had begun with a *laissez-faire* attitude and a general focus on tolerance, but there was now a realisation that this was not enough. Mathews located this change in the general public coming to terms with two factors: the permanence of black people within the nation, and that Britain had as much prejudice and discrimination as any other country. Mathews challenged the idea that opposition to 'immigration' was rooted in social or economic concerns and noted that, 'People are evidently able to deplore prejudice without perceiving that they are one of its causes'. He also insisted on the development of a specifically Christian point of view in respect of 'race relations' and asserted that Christians could not continue to rely on secular approaches.¹⁷⁰ This was a point of view perhaps related to concerns that Christians and the churches were seen as

169 Clifford S. Hill and David Mathews, eds., *Race: A Christian Symposium* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1968).

170 David Mathews, 'Introductory', in *Race*, ed. by Hill and Mathews, pp. 15–21, quote from p. 18.

reflecting rather than *forming* opinions on this matter.¹⁷¹

In general the chapters reflect a confusion over 'race' which was evident in most discussions of 'race' and 'race relations' during this period. In a chapter by an anthropologist, 'race' was directly challenged as having no validity and as being wrongly used to signify linguistic, political, cultural, or somatic groups.¹⁷²

Elsewhere, a psychologist and physician asserted that there was one human species containing numerous 'races'; whilst others spoke as if 'race' were real without directly addressing it as such.¹⁷³ These contradictory viewpoints within one text attempting to address the subject reflect a fundamental inadequacy in the theorising of 'race', and consequentially of racism and 'race relations' at that time. Indeed, in some ways, the anti-racist work of the Quaker Catherine Impey in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century reflected a more sophisticated grappling with the subject. Impey shunned the word 'race' as unreal, preferring to use the word 'caste', and attempted to create an anti-racist language which both exposed racial prejudice *and* avoided the reinforcement of the idea of 'race'. (It is important to hold in mind that when using the word 'caste', Impey was not drawing from the Indian experience, but rather from discussions on racialised differences in the USA by anthropologists who rejected the word 'race' in favour of 'caste'.) Impey was more certain of the illegitimacy of 'race' than these writers a century later, even if she was not always able to articulate herself without using the term, or in ways that seem adequate to a modern reader.¹⁷⁴

Despite common usage during the later part of the sixties, the terms 'racism' or 'racialism' were avoided in this text with the terms 'prejudice' and 'discrimination' being deployed instead. Two of the chapters by professionals dealt explicitly with prejudice: Sheila Patterson identified the different forms it had taken in

171 'A Look at Britain', p. 163. Reporting on British 'race relations' in 1962, Daisuke Kitagawa of the WCC noted that the churches had not been as active in this field as they might, and pointed to the 'missionary zeal' of the academics engaged in scholarly studies of 'race relations' who were willing to assist the churches. WCC, 4223.0.03, Daisuke Kitagawa, *The Churches and Race Relations in Britain: Impressions gained from a preliminary enquiry made with the aid of the Race Relations Institute*, 27 April – 4 May 1962.

172 David R. Hughes, 'The Biology of Race', in *Race*, ed. by Hill and Mathews, pp. 89–103.

173 David Stafford-Clark, 'The Psychology of Prejudice', in *Race*, ed. by Hill and Mathews, pp. 67–88 (p. 71). Philip Mason, 'Migration in a World Setting', in *Race*, ed. by Hill and Mathews, pp. 23–35 (pp. 31–32).

174 Caroline Bressey, *Empire, Race and the Politics of Anti-Caste* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 19, 52–59.

British society. Patterson noted the ambivalence of the abolitionists and philanthropists: that whilst they opposed slavery and were monogenists, they still often did not view black people as equal to whites. She also noted how Darwin's ideas were used to construct ethno-nationalisms and to consequentially justify white domination in the 'scramble for Africa'. How the 'self-righteous jingoism' of Empire eventually turned into a 'responsible paternalism'; and how all of these ideas had 'left a set of blurred and muddled traces on public opinion and attitudes in Britain'.¹⁷⁵ In contrast to these rationalisations, David Stafford-Clark rooted prejudice in an emotional state of being saying that 'the various keys to prejudice all hang from one ring, and this ring is the innate, inevitable, yet tragic self-centredness of the human personality'.¹⁷⁶

In comparison to the Wood and Downing text below, the joint chapter in *Race* by the nameless 'Indian Immigrant', 'West Indian Social Worker', and 'African Student' was much less hard-hitting. Nevertheless, the writers underscored the ignorance they had encountered in that whites did not know of, nor bother to learn about, the ways and customs of other people. Indeed, these writers stated that the inability of white people to face up to the 'canker of prejudice and discrimination in the heart of society' was the root cause of much bitterness, and was responsible for many black people becoming prejudiced towards white British people.¹⁷⁷ In this way, one can find in this book an example of the bifurcated narratives uncovered in the introductory chapter. The joint chapter written by people of colour repeatedly placed experiences of discrimination at the heart of the debate, whereas the other chapters by white authors often side-stepped the issue.

In contrast to the above ambiguous text, Wilfred Wood and John Downing's book *Vicious Circle*, which was published in the same year, was much more decisive in tone.¹⁷⁸ The authors were both clergymen: one black, one white.

175 Sheila Patterson, 'Racial Images and Attitudes in Britain – The Background', in *Race*, ed. by Hill and Mathews, pp. 51–68, quote from p. 66.

176 Stafford-Clark, 'The Psychology of Prejudice', p. 78.

177 'A Look at Britain', pp. 154–155, 161–162, 167.

178 The editorial preface stated that it was a fatal assumption that Christianity should be confined to private spirituality and piety. Rather, Christianity must assert itself in respect of political, social, cultural, national, and international life. Martin Jarrett-Kerr, "'Here and Now' Books", in Wilfred Wood and John Downing, *Vicious Circle* (London: SPCK, 1968), pp. 5–6.

Their focus was not on 'race' but on racism and they rooted their arguments in globalised wealth disparity and capitalist exploitation, and the prescience of Du Bois' comments on the 'colour line'. As with the final chapter by black Christians referred to above, the authors made reference to a generalised ignorance of people of colour on the part of white British people. They rooted the ignorance interpersonally due to a lack of friendships between black and white people, as well as historically in terms of an ignorance of the colonial past. They noted how the imperial past had bestowed upon white people a false sense of superiority which was rarely questioned because the historic dehumanisation of black people had made it difficult for whites to view black people as human. In this way, they also reminded the reader that '*Black people do not have to wait for white recognition in order to be human*'. Finally, the authors noted that whites were still of the mistaken opinion that Britain had been generous towards black people in the course of Empire and after.¹⁷⁹ This mistaken opinion is often reflected in the letters discussed in Chapter Five.

Compared to the texts of a decade earlier, this book held no punches and was much more confrontational, critical, and defiant in respect of the myth of tolerance. Like Canon Hay above, Wood was also from the Caribbean (Barbados) and therefore spoke from bitter experience.¹⁸⁰ The authors evaluated social areas which affected 'race relations' such as housing, education, the police, and trade unions, and also provided solutions as to how to overcome discriminatory practises in these areas. Additionally, they were deeply critical of the Race Relations Act which, despite its extension in 1968, they still viewed as weak: 'A bad law is one which cannot achieve its object. In this case the object is justice for black citizens'. Unlike other texts, the authors also discussed the issue of institutional racism, which they outlined as the key problem (rather than individual racism). With this, they told the reader that institutional racism was dependent, as a system, on keeping disadvantaged people at a disadvantage, and as such, it did not need discriminatory laws. Finally, they cautioned that unless white people took up opposition to

179 Wood and Downing, *Vicious Circle*, pp. 11–45, quote from p. 45, *emphasis theirs*. W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York, NY: Dover, 1903, repr. 1994).

180 See the following recording for an interview with Bishop Wood discussing his experiences of racism in Britain. BCA, Record/1/23, Interview with Bishop Wilfred Wood and Jeillo Edwards, n.d., c. 1990s.

institutional racism, there was the likelihood of an increase in individual racism on the part of black people, which might eventually be expressed through violence.¹⁸¹

World Council of Churches Statements on 'Race' and 'Race Relations'

This evolution of perspective of English or British Christians in respect of 'race' and 'race relations' was paralleled by the World Council of Churches (WCC).

The WCC had made statements on racism (or racial prejudice) since its inception in 1948 which have been collected into booklets at various times.¹⁸²

Before turning to these statements, a brief word on the WCC and the ecumenical movement shall be given. The ecumenical movement can be dated to 1857 with the founding of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, but is generally considered to have gained impetus in 1910 with the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh. Fundamentally, the ecumenical movement is the quest of many (but not all) Christian churches for reconciliation and the restoration of Christian unity.¹⁸³ Rather than accepting the proliferation of distinct churches as normative, the ecumenical movement sees these historical divisions as a factor which has 'contributed to divisions among peoples and nations', and as 'a scandal and an impediment to the Christian message'. Like the YWCA, YMCA, World Student Christian Movement, and so forth, the WCC is then a product of this movement towards visible and meaningful unity and it was formally established in 1948 when 90 churches voted to form it.¹⁸⁴ The WCC is a membership body; it is not a super-church, does not subscribe to a particular conception of the church, is not a legislative body, and has no power over individual churches. Rather, its existence is witness to the belief that there is just 'one church of Jesus Christ' and

181 Wood and Downing, *Vicious Circle*, pp. 47–80, quote from p. 58.

182 For instance: World Council of Churches, *Ecumenical Statements on Race Relations: Development of Ecumenical Thought on Race Relations, 1937-1964* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1965). Ans J. van der Bent, ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements and Actions on Racism, 1948-1979* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1980). Ans J. van der Bent, ed., *Breaking Down the Walls: World Council of Churches Statements and Actions on Racism, 1948-1985* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1986).

183 On this, whilst the Roman Catholic church is a part of the ecumenical movement, it is not a part of the WCC. Thomas E. Fitzgerald, *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History* (London: Praeger, 2004), p. 1. 'Member Churches', World Council of Churches, <<http://www.oikoumene.org/en/member-churches>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

184 By the end of 2013, the figure stood at 345 member churches. 'History', World Council of Churches, <<http://www.oikoumene.org/en/about-us/wcc-history>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

membership is about expressing solidarity with other churches.¹⁸⁵

Ans J. van der Bent, who was the director of the library of the WCC and the author of many ecumenical works, has said that 'the history of twentieth century ecumenical preoccupation with worldwide racism falls into two parts: before and after 1968'. 1968 is of course famous for the Prague Spring, the murder of Martin Luther King, Jr., mass student and civil rights protests, Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech, and the Vietnam War.¹⁸⁶ However, it was also a turning point for the WCC since after that year, the WCC went from opposing racism through sermons and resolutions, to real and practical support of anti-racist resistance movements through the establishment of the Programme to Combat Racism (PCR) in 1969.¹⁸⁷ It is impossible to do justice to the full statements issued by the WCC over the course of the decade, but below certain aspects will be drawn out to illustrate the growing sense of urgency in respect of 'race' and racism expressed by the WCC. Below only the period up until, and including, 1968 will be discussed as the events of 1969 and after are in Chapter Six.

The statement issued at Cottesloe (Johannesburg) in 1960 related specifically to the South African situation, which van der Bent says was the main concern of the WCC between 1946-1968. There was reference to the 'complex problems of human relationships' and at this time, the WCC called for the eradication of structural inequalities such as job restrictions and the denial of direct representation of non-whites in parliament. As in some of the other texts of the early sixties outlined above, there was also a reference to the inadvisability of 'mixed-marriages', even though they found no scriptural grounds for it.¹⁸⁸ At this time, the WCC also noted the revival of indigenous African religious practises and said,

We regard with deep concern the revival in many areas of African society of heathen tribal customs incompatible with Christian beliefs and practice. We believe this reaction is partly the result of a deep sense of frustration

¹⁸⁵ Fitzgerald, *The Ecumenical Movement*, pp. 1–5, 110–111, quote from p. 5.

¹⁸⁶ See the following for a readable overview of the year: Mark Kurlansky, *1968: The Year that Rocked the World* (London: Vintage, 2005). See also: Chris Harman, *The Fire Last Time: 1968 and After* (London: Bookmarks, 1988).

¹⁸⁷ Ans J. van der Bent, 'Logs in Our Eyes: The Struggle of the Ecumenical Movement Against Racism', *The Ecumenical Review*, 32 (1980), 166–272 (pp. 166–167).

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 169–170. van der Bent, ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements*, pp. 11–20.

and a loss of faith in Western Civilisation.¹⁸⁹

This loss of faith was in part a direct product of the South African apartheid regime.

It is clear that the WCC was aware of a growing revolutionary spirit across the world which had arisen in response to white domination and prejudice. The WCC understood that a revolution of sorts was taking place from the USA to South Africa, and feared that without strong Christian leadership, nationalism would not be directed towards 'just and worthy ends', and may become 'perverted'. Therefore, by the Mindolo (Zambia) Consultation in 1964, the WCC noted that the South African and Southern Rhodesian situations had created a conviction amongst leading African figures that since, over a period of many years, peaceful measures had failed to achieve justice, that there was only one route left: that of violence. By this point, the WCC was convinced of the urgency of the situation and advocated negotiation to avoid this eventuality. Importantly, the Mindolo statement also noted the *guilt* of white Christians in terms of their long involvement with, and responsibility for, oppressive situations in southern Africa. As well as their 'sinful silence' shown by their failure to identify with the oppressed, which meant that they consequentially did not speak out against oppression.¹⁹⁰

These changes towards white (Christian) culpability continued to strengthen, and by the 1966 Church and Society Conference in Geneva, there was a concern to situate 'racial and ethnic problems' in the *structural and economic spheres*. At this conference, it was acknowledged that the 'white race' dominated the world both economically and politically, and that this domination prevented the development of an authentic human community both nationally and internationally. Christians were urged to be 'passionately concerned' with breaking this domination down as it was seen as an idolatrous structure which inhibited God's purpose in history. As such, Christians and the churches were urged to oppose myths of racial superiority wherever they found its expression,

189 van der Bent, ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements*, p. 12. From the mid-fifties, many Christian missionaries were also concerned with losing the 'soul of Africa' to Islam for similar reasons. See, for example: 'Summary of the News: Poison from Cairo', *Church Times*, 21 October 1955, p. 3. 'Apartheid is White Comfort and African Misery, says Primate. Christians Must Wipe Out This Open Sore', *Church Times*, 2 October 1959, p. 1. 'Change of Technique Needed in Africa', *Church Times*, 5 May 1961, p. 16.

190 van der Bent, ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements*, pp. 18–20.

and to work towards achieving an equal and pluralistic society through changes in legislation, corporate action, and social planning. Christian reconciliation was now about more than 'sentimental harmonising'; rather, they saw it as demanding personal sacrifice, as an identification with the oppressed, and a determination to break down unjust patterns. To this end, verbal condemnation was no longer enough, it was felt that Christians must *actively* join in the struggle for radical change.¹⁹¹

The Fourth Assembly of the WCC in Uppsala in 1968 saw a further and significant strengthening of this position.¹⁹² The language now was urgent: racism robbed human rights of all meanings, was a denial of the Christian faith, and an imminent danger to world peace. Importantly though, the Uppsala Assembly saw the world churches directed to the phenomenon of *white racism* for the first time.¹⁹³ The focus on white racism in particular was because of an increasing awareness of the growing divide between the 'haves and have nots'; or, in other words, an awareness of the alignment between whiteness, affluence and global power *vis-à-vis* the alignment of non-whiteness, poverty and the determination to overthrow racist and exploitative structures.¹⁹⁴ The WCC saw the fights against this ever growing divide as meaning that the struggles to achieve 'racial justice' had now entered a new revolutionary, and potentially violent, phase. Therefore, approaches to discrimination from a purely legal perspective were fundamentally inadequate. The WCC also noted how this divide between the 'haves and have nots' manifested in a discrepancy of comprehension: people in developed countries were unaware of how past

191 van der Bent, ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements*, pp. 20–22.

192 To this end, Anwar M. Barkat, the second director of the PCR, said that the 1966 conference had a considerable impact on the Uppsala Assembly. See: Thomas A. Mulhall, *A Lasting Prophetic Legacy: Martin Luther King Jr., The World Council of Churches, and the Global Crusade Against Racism and War* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014), p. 142.

193 At this time, the WCC defined racism generally as 'ethnocentric pride in one's own racial group, preference for the distinctive characteristics of that group, belief that these characteristics are biological and passed on to succeeding generations through the genes, the doctrine of immutable racial differences, strong negative feelings towards other groups who do not share one's own biological (and cultural) characteristics coupled with the thrust to discriminate against and exclude the outgroup from full participation in the life of the community'. WCC, 4223.1.01, Background Statement on White Racism, Document No. 12, July 1968, emphasis theirs.

194 John White, 'Rich Countries and Poor', in *Matters of Principle: Labour's Last Chance*, ed. by Tyrrell Burgess, *et. al.* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), pp. 54–69 (p. 69). This was also highlighted by the Haslemere Group whose core membership was largely Christian. See: The Haslemere Committee, *The Haslemere Declaration* (London: The Haslemere Committee, n.d., c. 1968).

systems of oppression effectively prohibited the emergence of exploited groups of people from colonialism as they were not equipped to deal with the world in an age of technological revolution. In contrast, these same technological advances, for instance affordable travel and the mass media, also made exploited people much more aware of the gap between their own situations and lives and that of their former colonisers.¹⁹⁵

The WCC themselves now also moved to a position which saw them rooting and historicising racist oppression in colonial, Christian, and Enlightenment pasts. This was a significant departure from the view prevailing until then which saw a tendency to root the *horror* of racism in the holocaust.¹⁹⁶ Despite being a global church organisation, the WCC was still a white dominated space at this time; as such, their systematic historical construction, and ownership, of racism makes for powerful reading and is worth quoting in length in order to witness the ways in which they brought the past into the structures and relationships of the present. They said,

The explosive potential of this deepening conflict cannot be adequately understood unless we bear in mind that we are now dealing with the result of a racial ideology developed and institutionalized over several centuries of European expansion, colonization and imperialism which included a protracted period of the most violent form of exploitation short of genocide – the dehumanizing international African slave trade in which most Western European countries participated, and three centuries of racial slavery in the Americas.¹⁹⁷

From that colonial history, they further confessed Christian ownership of this past by noting that,

In the early contacts between Europeans and Africans, the rationalization for the lucrative commerce in human flesh was that of Christianizing infidels. But when some of the newly enslaved peoples began to embrace Christianity, by implication challenging the basis of slavery, other rationalizations were found. Among these were citations of the Holy Scriptures and assertion that Africans were descendants of Noah's son Ham upon whom was placed the Biblical curse of blackness and perpetual servitude.¹⁹⁸

And then moving back into a generalised white responsibility, they stated that

195 WCC, 4223.1.01, Background Statement on White Racism, Document No. 12, July 1968.

196 See Chapter Five for more on this.

197 WCC, 4223.1.01, Background Statement on White Racism, Document No. 12, July 1968, emphasis theirs.

198 *Ibid.*.

with the arrival of Enlightenment ideas of human liberty it was again 'necessary' to construct a framework through which to except Africans from the community of humankind. As such,

European and American scholars in the developing biological sciences built a framework of scientific thought which challenged the Judeo-Christian view of the unity of the human family and asserted a hierarchy of races, of which the Caucasian was at the apex and the African at the lowest level. Other racial groups were assigned intermediate positions on this scale.¹⁹⁹

The WCC noted how the post-war era saw the delegitimisation of scientific racist doctrines because of the genocide of Jewish people in Europe, and with the notable exception of South Africa, most white-dominated countries had now legislated against racism. Yet, 'These successful challenges, however, succeeded in removing only the visible part of the iceberg of racism. The doctrine has lost its respectability but the infra-structure of power which perpetuates its effects remains substantially unchanged'. In this way, the institutionalised aspects of racism meant that the full participation of non-white people, in global and local ways, was impeded. Since racism meant that many groups of people had been excluded from the human community in Christian-dominated societies, this meant that 'all power decisions taken in political and social structures are incomplete decisions because they do not reflect the collective wisdom of the entire spectrum of the human community'.²⁰⁰

The WCC therefore read 'race'-based situations as 'a power confrontation of revolutionary implications' and raised the crucial question of the role of Christians and the churches in light of this. What was it then that Christians were called to do? Predictably they were called to 'bring a gospel of hope, love and promise of redemption in the midst of revolution'; but they were also called to *act* to bring about new structures of reconciliation. To do this, they were to not only *affirm* the unity of humankind in their personal relationships but also to *act* in their 'secular lives' to change the conditions in which racism flourished, and to insist on the renunciation of military violence by states.²⁰¹ As we shall see, an attention to violence was to reappear after the Consultation on White Racism discussed in Chapter Six, albeit in a very different guise. Despite the radical

199 WCC, 4223.1.01, Background Statement on White Racism, Document No. 12, July 1968.

200 *Ibid.*

201 *Ibid.*

critique of white racism embarked on during the Uppsala Assembly, there was a still a traditional emphasis on non-violence, reconciliation, and love. And despite calls to act on institutional and moral levels, there was no specific *corporate plan* in place at this time.

James Baldwin also spoke at the Uppsala Assembly and it was to prove an incredibly powerful speech from the point of view of its impact on those white Christians listening. Moreover, it proved highly influential in terms of framing the 1969 Consultation in Notting Hill and the ongoing work of the WCC.²⁰² Early on in his speech, Baldwin told his audience that he addressed them as 'one of God's creatures, whom the Christian Church has most betrayed'. A damning statement which deeply affected many English Christians, and which set the tone for the rest of his speech.²⁰³ Baldwin's condemnation of the church was carefully crafted and spoke to the Christians present in their own language: a language of Christ whom should be for the least of humankind, and yet was reserved for whites by virtue of their construction of a blond haired, blue eyed Jesus; and, too, by the development of a culture which idealised white values, thereby constraining and inhibiting black people. Weaving the history of Christianity with the history of slavery, Baldwin warned his audience that his experiences and this history had taught him to disregard the *words* of the Christian church, and to concentrate on its *deeds*. And more, as a black adult, he said that it was 'perfectly true that one can see that the destruction of the Christian Church as it is presently constituted may not only be desirable but may be necessary'.²⁰⁴

Baldwin accused the church of betraying its principles in favour of achieving power. Further, he noted that whilst the operation and nature of *white* power went unnoticed and unremarked upon, the conjunction of the words 'black' and 'power' was deemed terrifying. He went on to defend Stokely Carmichael (who

202 Martin Luther King, Jr. was originally scheduled to speak. However, after MLK's murder in April 1968, James Baldwin, who was greatly admired by MLK, was invited in his place. Mulhall, *A Lasting Prophetic Legacy*, p. 135. Fitzgerald, *The Ecumenical Movement*, p. 114.

203 It was this quote in particular which affected many in his audience so much. See the comments from Trevor Huddleston in Chapter Six, and also: Kenneth Sansbury, *Combatting Racism: The British Churches and the WCC Programme to Combat Racism* (London: BCC, 1975, repr. 1978), p. 8.

204 WCC, 4223.1.01, James Baldwin, White Racism or World Community?, Document No. 27, World Council of Churches Fourth Assembly, Uppsala, July 1968. This document is the transcript of a speech and not a written text by Baldwin. See the following essay by Baldwin for more on his relationship with, and views of, Christianity: 'Down at the Cross', pp. 19–89.

had started life as a Christian) and Black Power philosophies as simply being about the 'self-determination of people'. Baldwin noted that after petitioning for a long time, and to no effect, a person must move to a revolutionary standpoint because a person was 'no longer a petitioner but has become a beggar. And at that moment one concludes, you will not do it, you cannot do it, it is not in you to do it, and therefore I must do it'. Therefore, he urged the churches to use their power to oppose the destruction of black people in South Africa; urged them to rise up and stop the assassination of another Martin Luther King, Jr.; urged them to force the US Government to stop dropping bombs in Vietnam. He warned that just as the Germans were not absolved of the genocide of Jewish people by claiming ignorance of it, so too would the churches not be absolved of these murders and destruction. Baldwin ended by warning his audience that, by failing to act against injustice, the churches were, in fact, securing their own destruction.²⁰⁵ These were, of course, hard-hitting statements and condemnations and it is noteworthy that the WCC was ready not only to hear them, but to use them as a signpost in order to prepare a plan of action. A plan which we will learn more about in Chapter Six.

English Christian Interventions: Archbishop Ramsey and Trevor Huddleston

Unlike the texts and statements discussed above, the statements under discussion here which were made by Archbishop Ramsey and Trevor Huddleston were not directed solely or specifically to the Christian community. Both figures were significant *public* moral forces in the sixties, and the ways they engaged in 'race relations' work reflected their position in society. Moreover, these two figures have been chosen to study together because they represent two distinct ways in which prominent Anglican Christians approached the issue (and indeed, Enoch Powell represents a third).²⁰⁶ Additionally, the speech of these two Christians was considered important enough by many members of the public to write to the figures in opposition to, and support of, the positions publicly taken by them. These letters are the subject of Chapter Five. As such, whilst there will be a general consideration of the positions taken by Huddleston and Ramsey, particular attention will be paid to the speeches,

205 WCC, 4223.1.01, James Baldwin, White Racism or World Community?, Document No. 27, World Council of Churches Fourth Assembly, Uppsala, July 1968, emphasis his.

206 To this end, Matthew Grimley notes the difficulty in talking of *an* Anglican position. Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', p. 207.

actions, letters, and debates on 'race relations' and 'immigration' they made which generated letters in response.

In respect of Archbishop Michael Ramsey, as Edson Burton has pointed out, the establishment nature of the Church of England and Ramsey's position within it, meant that he had an allegiance to the status quo that is not necessarily found in other Christian figures who were vocal *in support of* 'race relations' and 'immigration' in the sixties. This relationship and status meant that Ramsey was in the position to influence government, whilst simultaneously also being reluctant to do so as strongly as other non-Establishment figures. This difficulty is amply illustrated by Ramsey's intervention in respect of the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Bill, which Burton states represents the beginning of Church of England opposition to the immigration policies of the government.²⁰⁷ Ramsey is recorded as calling the Bill 'lamentable' and 'deplorable', yet at the same time, he also defended the government by saying that 'it is utterly unfair to ascribe to their motive any intention whatever of colour discrimination'. Ramsey said that the demand for the legislation, and prejudice more generally, came from housing resource issues, thereby laying the blame for the legislation squarely on the working classes.²⁰⁸ In contrast, other Anglican commentators at the time said that the Bill was morally wrong, and the wrong thing done in the worst possible way.²⁰⁹ Even more strident was the Conservative Church Commissioner Lord Hawke. Hawke criticised Ramsey by asking how it was possible to take the position Ramsey had 'and at the same time, be considered to have any Christian ideas'.²¹⁰

Despite (or perhaps because of) this comparative weakness, Ramsey's position was widely regarded by elites at the time, and led to him being offered the position of chairman in the newly formed National Committee for

207 Prior to this point, Edson Burton states that the Church had stood opposed to migration from the 'New Commonwealth' as it went against its vision of colonial self-development. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 240–242.

208 *Hansard*, HL Deb 12 March 1962, Vol 238, Cols 24–26. Burton has also noted the numerous evasions made by Ramsey in this speech. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 257–258.

209 The first comment was made by Canon Bryan Green: 'Canon's Protest Against Migration Bill', *Church Times*, 16 February 1962, p. 19. The second by the Archbishop of the West Indies, Alan Knight: 'Immigration Bill "Deplorable," Says Archbishop', *Church Times*, 8 December 1961, p. 3.

210 Hawke was later taken to task by the Archbishop for his comments. 'Dr. Ramsey Calls Immigration Bill "Lamentable". "Fight Conditions That Are Closing the Door"', *Church Times*, 16 March 1962, pp. 1, 24.

Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI) in 1965.²¹¹ Indeed, in his letter to Ramsey offering him the chairmanship, the Prime Minister Harold Wilson stated that Ramsey's acceptance of the post would help create the prestige considered necessary for the effective operation of the organisation.²¹² NCCI (pronounced 'Nicki') was the third official governmental body set up to deal with 'Commonwealth immigration' and its origins were in a set of recommendations contained in the controversial 1965 White Paper *Immigration from the Commonwealth*.²¹³ NCCI was to operate autonomously from the government and be comprised of individuals who were able to bring specialist knowledge and experience 'to bear on the problems arising from Commonwealth immigration' in order to 'co-ordinate on a national basis efforts directed towards the integration of Commonwealth immigrants into the community'.²¹⁴ NCCI worked through a series of expert panels and liaison committees which had four main areas of work: information assemblage, welfare assistance to 'immigrants', public relations work, and anti-discrimination work.²¹⁵ Whilst there is not space to detail them, it should be noted that NCCI was subject to varied and vigorous attacks by people who worked in the 'race relations' and 'immigration' field at the time. The reasons for the attacks ranged from the organisation serving as a smoke screen, to it being paternalistic, to it failing to affect government policies, and for destroying the nascent civil rights movement in Britain.²¹⁶

Within the church, it was hoped that Ramsey's decision to accept the position of chair of NCCI would help spur a greater number of Christians to action over 'the

211 Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', p. 209. Hill and Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations*, p. 19.

212 Although there was also some concerns that it might be considered proselytising by Muslims. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 1–4, 11, 15, 17–18.

213 It was preceded by the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council (CIAC) which was set up in 1962 by the Home Secretary, and the National Advisory Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NACCI) which was set up in April 1964. *Immigration from the Commonwealth*, Cmnd. 2739 (London: HMSO, 1965), pp. 16–18. See the following for more on NCCI as well as the references given below in n. 216: Hill and Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations*. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 522–525.

214 National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, *The First Six Months: a report of the work of the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants from September 1965 to March 1966* (London: NCCI, 1966), pp. 3, 12.

215 The National Archives (TNA), HO 230/7, History of NACCI and NCCI, n.d..

216 Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', pp. 25–78. Hill and Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations*, pp. 28–31. Heineman, Jr., *The Politics of the Powerless*, pp. 50–52, 145–154. John Rex, 'The Race Relations Catastrophe', in *Matters of Principle*, ed. by Burgess, *et. al.*, pp. 70–83 (pp. 75–78). See Chapter Three for a case study of the Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council (IRC) which bears out these criticisms.

problem' that was (white people's response to) black migration to Britain. His public statement of acceptance saw him hoping that the 'tackling of practical problems' would lead to the lessening of racial prejudice, but, in it, we also witness him splitting the 'we' of nation from the 'immigrants' he hoped would 'live happily among us'.²¹⁷ This splitting was a position Revd Kitagawa had warned against three years earlier.²¹⁸ Despite the positive hopes of Ramsey, his advisors, and the government in respect of his decision to act as chair, it was also a decision which came under criticism from multiple angles.²¹⁹ Not only did it result in a batch of angry letters from the general public who were opposed to 'immigration from the Commonwealth', but he also received criticism from people working in the field of 'race relations' such as Revd (later Bishop) Wilfred Wood, Hamza Alavi, and Avtar Jouhl.

Wood considered the White Paper to reveal 'a policy racial in content and hypocritical in purpose', and stated that it was becoming more difficult 'to assure anxious, thinking people that the Way of the Church is the way to social justice'. Wood's concerns related to the immigration restriction aspect of the paper and in his reply, Ramsey sought to make a distinction between what he saw the role of NCCI as being – that of the welfare of black migrants – and immigration restrictions. He said that while he *personally* would want to criticise immigration restrictions, this was not the task of the Committee. Whilst this reply seemingly pacified Wood, this attempt to split out concerns over 'welfare' and 'race relations' from 'immigration' was not accepted by Hamza Alavi, who was also a NCCI and CARD Committee member.²²⁰ In stronger terms, Avtar Jouhl angrily rejected Ramsey's offer to be a part of the Committee, stating that NCCI was a product of the same duplicitous White Paper which sought both to discriminate against black Britons *and* attempt to integrate them.²²¹ Ramsey then, could not

217 LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 5–7, 77.

218 See the Introduction.

219 To add to those, it is difficult to take his sincerity seriously given his failure to make time for Martin Luther King, Jr during his two flying visits in 1964. Whilst it is true that Ramsey offered to host MLK at his Canterbury residence for lunch on his second visit on his way back from receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, it seems not more than an empty gesture given MLK's gruelling schedule and his ill health due to exhaustion. LPA, Ramsey 60, ff. 1–13.

220 CARD was The Campaign Against Racial Discrimination. See the following for more: Heineman, Jr., *The Politics of the Powerless*. Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', pp. 25–78. Lent, *British Social Movements*, pp. 18–24.

221 Other criticisms came from Ann Dummett who called for greater black and working-class representation on the Committee. Kitagawa was also adamant that 'race relations' could not

win.²²²

Alongside his position of Archbishop, part of what opened Ramsey up to criticisms from all sides was the fact that he was a quintessential liberal. His speeches obviously reflected that and in seeking to appease both sides of the debate, he effectively succeeded only in angering all those others who stood outwith the liberal framework.²²³ Even before he had spoken during a House of Lords debate on the forthcoming Bill, he received many letters from members of the public, and indeed from the House of Lords itself, both in support of his position and also in condemnation.²²⁴ Unlike more strident voices such as that of Huddleston below, Ramsey sought not to root his arguments in the experience of the oppressed and victimised, but rather he attempted to mediate between what he saw as the different interests of black and white people. In contrast to his earlier comments to Wood, Ramsey now conceded to the idea of immigration restrictions *in principle*. However, he also noted the 'virtual' distinctions of 'race' made by the Bill as was evidenced by the 'grandfather clause', and said the Bill had generated 'dismay and distrust' because it represented a virtual breaking of the country's word.²²⁵

In seeking to unpick the mechanics of the Bill's language, Ramsey said,

First, let us take the question of race. Clause 1, on any showing, creates two levels of United Kingdom citizens. Strictly, the level is not that of race; strictly the grandfather clause means not race, but geography. But the actual effect on the bulk of the human situation with which the Bill is dealing is that the one level is the level of the European and the other level is the level of the Asian citizens. And that is so because the object of the exercise, and the apology for the exercise, is that we must keep an influx of Asian citizens out of the country. It is inevitable, but virtually the clause is thus read in its practical effect and implication and, indeed, underlying

be separated out from 'immigration'. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 55–56, 78–80, 101, 127, 217. WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, p. 2. See also the following for comments on the criticisms Ramsey received: Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 278–281.

222 See the following for a longer discussion of the racialised tensions *within* NCCI: Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 345–361.

223 Andrew Thorpe makes a similar point in respect of the Labour Party: he says that in trying to appeal to both black and white voters in respect of immigration and 'race relations' legislation, they were fundamentally unable to fully satisfy either group. Andrew Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party, Second Edition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 161–162.

224 LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 1–94. The press reported widely in anticipation of his forthcoming speech. See for instance, Our Political Staff, 'Dr Ramsey to see the Home Secretary on Kenya Asians', *Observer*, 25 February 1968, p. 3.

225 *Hansard*, HL Deb 29 February 1968, Vol 289, Cols 949–955.

purpose.²²⁶

This refusal to engage with the obfuscations of the wording of the Bill represents a significant departure from his earlier position which, as shown above, saw him firmly in the establishment court and denying any racist motive to the 1962 Act. This change can likely be rooted in two things: the fact that neither Ramsey nor NCCI were consulted in respect of the Bill, and the fact that Ramsey's position as chair of NCCI put him in greater contact with black opinion which affected his own point of view. However, despite this shift in his politics, his establishment position meant there was only so far he could go in his opposition to government policies.²²⁷

Ramsey continued to be critical of the 1968 Immigration Act. For instance, in March of that year, he wrote to Harold Wilson expressing concern over the Act and, as with his House of Lords speech, stated that the work of NCCI had been 'gravely undermined' as a consequence of the Act. He again said that 'The main criticism which the Committee has against the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968 is the evidence of racial discrimination contained in Section 1'; because of this, NCCI requested that it be 'repealed as soon as possible'.²²⁸ Whilst the contents of the letter cannot be considered Ramsey's feelings or thoughts alone – he was writing in the capacity of chair of NCCI – it is noteworthy that he signed his name to a document which effectively called out the government as racist. In this way, Edson Burton's summation that the Church of England more generally had engaged in a 'volte face' by 1968 is evidenced clearly here in Ramsey's missive. This shows that an important outcome of Ramsey's intervention was that it helped strengthen church policy in the long run, even if it was ineffective in terms of affecting government legislation at the time.²²⁹

Ramsey's strengthening of stance can be seen again later that year during an

226 *Hansard*, HL Deb 29 February 1968, Vol 289, Cols 949–955.

227 *Hansard*, HL Deb 29 February 1968, Vol 289, Col 951. Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', pp. 304–310. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', p. 277.

228 TNA, HO 231/22, Letter from Archbishop Ramsey to Harold Wilson, 11 March 1968. The same file also contains similar criticisms regarding the proposed policy to limit immigration from the Commonwealth announced in the White Paper in an earlier letter and memorandum: Letter from Archbishop Ramsey to Harold Wilson, 14 December 1966. National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, The Government White Paper Immigration from the Commonwealth (Cmnd 2739), Memorandum Approved by the Finance and General Purposes Committee for Presentation to the Prime Minister, n.d., c. October 1965.

229 Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 276–277, 312.

address to Commonwealth Correspondents in June. Here, rather than the assimilationist stance of the earlier part of the decade, he promoted the definition of 'integration' in the terms set out by Roy Jenkins: "equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of tolerance". Whilst advancing the idea that migrants needed to adapt themselves to living in a new country, Ramsey was not also of the opinion that Britain should adapt or change itself alongside them: the task for Britain was simply to *accept* difference. In this speech he was also critical of the 1968 Race Relations Act then before parliament, stating that it needed to be much stronger. This is again a significant advance for a church official: the Anglican church was originally opposed to anti-discrimination legislation as they believed that it would inflame 'racial tensions', and because they were against 'special treatment' of particular groups.²³⁰

However, despite these more progressive points of view, there were limits to the amount of solidarity that Archbishop Ramsey was happy to express. As was noted above, NCCI was not consulted in respect of the 1968 Immigration Act and this caused much uproar amongst Committee and Advisory Panel members, and threats of mass resignations therefore ensued. Summing the situation up, Revd Wilfred Wood stated that NCCI had been totally discredited by the fact that the government's policy was one of the appeasement of racists.²³¹ Hill and Issacharoff have noted that the whole community relations movement came very close to breaking down at this point and only survived because either there were enough apolitical welfare oriented organisations to keep it going, or the more militant committees were too reliant on government funding to take their position as far as they wanted. As Burton notes, had the Archbishop also chosen to publicly resign at this juncture it would have been interpreted as an act of solidarity with black people. However, in contrast, his office vigorously rejected any suggestion of his resignation. Therefore, whilst it is likely that the weakness of the 1968 Race Relations Act, in conjunction with

230 TNA, HO 231/23, Address to the Commonwealth Correspondents by the Archbishop of Canterbury, 14 June 1968. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 267–273.

231 Commonwealth Staff, 'Archbishop's team ready to resign', *Observer*, 3 March 1968, p. 2. Staff Reporter, 'Race relations work "put back 10 years"', *The Times*, 2 March 1968, p. 1. LPA, Ramsey 129, ff. 22, 44. Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', pp. 209–210. Staff Reporter, 'Clash in Racial Liaison Work. Vote for a new organization', *The Times*, 11 March, 1968, p. 2.

the discriminatory 1968 Immigration Act, was what led Ramsey to choose not to continue his role into the successor body the Community Relations Commission, he clearly did not feel strongly enough to take an openly defiant stance.²³²

In contrast to Ramsey's middle-ground position is the strident figure of the Rt Revd Trevor Huddleston (later Bishop, then Archbishop). Huddleston is known predominately for his anti-apartheid work in South Africa but he was also active and vocal in England on issues of 'race', especially later in the decade in response to Enoch Powell's various speeches. As with Ramsey, the focus of Huddleston's interventions in English 'race relations' will be the moments which generated the most amount of letters from the general public which are the subject of analysis in Chapter Five. Despite this focus on the latter part of the decade, it should not be understood that Huddleston was silent on racialised situations in Britain prior to this, as his comments on the white violence of 1958 given in the previous chapter show.²³³

On 21 November 1968, *The Times* published a letter from Huddleston containing a strong criticism of Enoch Powell's Eastbourne speech on 16 November 1968. In this speech, Powell continued with his calls for repatriation and assertions that areas of Britain were turning into 'alien territory'.²³⁴ In his letter of response, Huddleston made good use of history and contemporary politics. For instance, he stated that 'England, by her participation in the slave-trade and by her colonial adventures over two centuries and more has been the greatest single contributor to the alienation of peoples from their mother lands'. He also asserted that England's acceptance of, and assistance to, white minority rule in South Africa and Rhodesia meant that the nation had no moral right to speak of 'alienation' within its own borders. He also spoke of the massive debt which England had to repay to those it had colonised and the task

232 LPA, Ramsey 129, ff. 29–30. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 307, 311–312. Hill and Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations*, p. 26. See Adam Lent for more on the relationship between community groups and government funding: *British Social Movements*, pp. 167–193.

233 For more on Huddleston see: Trevor Huddleston, *Naught for Your Comfort* (Glasgow: William Collins / Fount, 1956, repr. 1987). Piers McGrandle, *Trevor Huddleston: Turbulent Priest* (London: Continuum, 2004). See the following for an excellent study of Powell/ism: Camilla Schofield, *Enoch Powell and the Making of Postcolonial Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

234 See, for instance, 'Mr Powell calls for repatriation by a Ministry', *Guardian*, 18 November 1968, p. 4. 'Powell again urges action on immigration', *The Times*, 18 November 1968, p. 3.

of reparations before it.²³⁵

The second intervention of interest here is a public lecture Huddleston gave at the headquarters of the National Union of Teachers (NUT) on 11 June 1969. This particular speech followed one made by Enoch Powell in Wolverhampton on 9 June 1969 during which, to an audience of seven hundred people, Powell again called for large-scale repatriation of black 'immigrants'.²³⁶ During his speech, Huddleston emphasised that the essential unity of 'mankind' was split by divisions of wealth and poverty, and even more so, referencing Du Bois, he noted that this division of affluence and hunger corresponded with divisions along the 'colour line'. As will be shown in Chapter Six, this alignment of 'race' and economics was by then a common argument in more radical Christian circles. Like many black leaders of the sixties, Huddleston was also quick to underscore the international aspect of 'race relations', and noted that the racist speech made by Powell in Wolverhampton had world-wide ramifications.²³⁷

Huddleston referenced Britain's colonial past *and* commercial present and used these facts to oblige Britain to give the moral lead in respect of 'race relations'. Huddleston felt that proper 'race relations' could only be formulated and understood if people were to lose their parochial outlook and understand their relationship with others in a global context. How can people call for repatriation when so much of British history had been one of movement away from this island, and had included the colonisation of other peoples and places, he asked? He also used the history of slavery to assert and support the rights of people of African heritage to make a claim to the ownership of Britain. As a consequence of this speech – an extract of it was to appear in *The Times* the following day – Huddleston received many letters, mostly critical and these will form part of the sources used in Chapter Five.²³⁸

Crucially, in the above lecture Huddleston denounced Powell's speech as 'evil'. He called the speech such as he believed the consequences of it would be to

235 Trevor Stepney, 'Not representative', *The Times*, 21 November 1968, p. 11.

236 See, for instance: 'Powell produces new figures to support his warning of immigration "disaster" and renews his plea for repatriation', *The Times*, 10 June 1969, p. 3. 'Mr Powell's £300M repatriation plan', *Guardian*, 10 June 1969, p. 1.

237 Trevor Huddleston, *Education and Human Rights: The text of a Public Lecture* (London: National Union of Teachers, 1969).

238 *Ibid.*, pp. 3–6. 'Powell speech on immigration was evil, bishop says', *The Times*, 12 June 1969, p. 2.

lower the dignity of humans on both sides of 'the colour line'. Powell had given renewed calls for repatriation in order to help lift the 'dark and ever more menacing shadow' of black people from Britain's shores. In the speech, Powell stated that the nation was under threat of violence and aggression from within as a consequence of 'immigration' just as it had, in the past, been threatened from without.²³⁹ In response to this, Huddleston stated that Powell had denied the *human rights* of black people; further, Huddleston asserted that the lineage of Powell's point of view was one of unending oppression and war. In consequence, Huddleston issued a challenge to Powell for a public debate.²⁴⁰

The Great Debate was consequentially shown on London Weekend Television (LWT) on 12 October 1969 with the topic being 'My Christian Duty'. The show still makes for extremely interesting viewing because it reflects not only two opposing views of 'immigration', 'race', and Britain's relationship with the world, but also two differing conceptions of 'religion'. Being called evil by a Bishop clearly stung Powell as a Christian and his position in the debate therefore hinged on dissociating his *public* role as a politician from his *privatised* Christian faith, as well as an attempt to 'defrock' Huddleston's speech. Powell claimed he was bound to speak from a local point of view and in the best interests of local people, whether that meant his (white) constituents in Wolverhampton or the (white) nation more generally, since that was his job. This was a position he constructed as being the lesser of two evils: he must speak up for his constituents even if that affected others elsewhere negatively. He asserted that Christianity had nothing to say for the specifics of his public role and that, therefore, both he and Huddleston spoke from a secular space on a secular issue. However later on, when Huddleston refused to accept that the situation was not a 'religious' one, he then questioned why his pronouncements on 'race' and 'immigration' were not Christian if Huddleston's were.²⁴¹ With this, he was effectively trying to reverse his earlier position, and de-privatise his interiorised 'faith'.

239 'Powell produces new figures to support his warning of immigration "disaster" and renews his plea for repatriation', *The Times*, 10 June 1969, p. 3.

240 Huddleston, *Education and Human Rights*, pp. 6–8. Our Churches Correspondent, 'Bishop asks Powell for public debate on racial issues', *The Times*, 13 June 1969, p. 3. Trevor Huddleston Papers (THP), 39, Letter from Enoch Powell to Trevor Huddleston, 12 June 1969. Letter from Trevor Huddleston to Enoch Powell, 12 June 1969.

241 British Film Institute (BFI), 15732, 'My Christian Duty', *The Great Debate*, LWT, 12 October 1969.

In contrast, Huddleston emphatically disagreed with Powell's definition of 'religion'. For Huddleston, 'religion' was not compartmentalised: social and political issues were also essentially 'religious issues'. He went on to further say that if Christianity had nothing to say about human situations, then it wasn't the faith for him as he was not interested in a 'religion' that was not concerned with 'man' where he was. Notable because of the fury it invoked in the letter writers, Huddleston also pressed Powell on why there was a sudden trauma over black British migration when migration to (and from) the British Isles had been a constant feature of British history. Powell refused to accept that post-war migration was in any way similar to earlier migrations of Jewish and Irish people, and stated that the timescale and numbers were different. In reply, Huddleston provoked Powell by saying that he estimated that there would be approximately ten million people of colour in Britain by the end of the century. For this he thanked God it as 'it may bring some fresh blood into this tired old country'.²⁴²

Much like his earlier NUT address, Huddleston repeatedly spoke from an internationalist position reminding viewers of the inherently universalist aspect of Christianity: it was not a western 'religion' and Jesus was not born an Englishman (nor a Palestinian nor an Irishman). His point being that Christianity was above nationalism. Racism was a 'burning issue' the world over and whereas black people were a minority in England, Huddleston reminded his audience that they were not so in a global sense. In this way, Huddleston countered Powell's localism by asserting that it was in the best interests of society to understand 'race and colour conflict' in a global sense and as such, Powell needed to consider the effect of his words on the greater aspect of (hu)mankind.²⁴³

Watching the *Great Debate* in the light of the letters it generated to both participants is striking. Powell was a highly accomplished orator and was incredibly comfortable being in front of a camera. There was one brief, but revealing, outburst after an audience member laughed and called him a liar when he claimed that he wouldn't do anything that he thought likely to increase intolerance. Otherwise, he was ever the statesman: reasoned, measured,

242 BFI, 15732, 'My Christian Duty', *The Great Debate*, LWT, 12 October 1969.

243 *Ibid.*.

thoughtful, composed. In contrast, Huddleston was highly self-conscious of the camera and often appeared smug and self-satisfied when he'd made a good point, and, even more unfortunately, occasionally spiteful when he was criticising Powell. The duality of personalities and politics as displayed in the TV show and reflected in the letters reminds one of a comment by Bill Schwarz in respect of the duality of Heath and Powell. Schwarz said,

Deference to Powell and hatred of Heath are not so much separate manifestations, as part and parcel of the same reverie. They represent a splitting of a single psychic object: on the one hand, the guardian of all virtue; on the other, all that is base and vile. Part of the interior psychic work of these letters is embodied in the endeavour to stake out the frontiers between the two – the good and the bad – desperate in their attempts to segregate virtue from all that which defiles.²⁴⁴

What makes Ramsey and Huddleston interesting is that these two public and influential Christian figures demonstrate two differing ways of engaging with 'race relations' from a broadly *positive* position. In contrast to Huddleston's strong internationalism and partisan usage of history, Ramsey attempted a soft and middle-ground position, although not without an evolution of thought as the sixties progressed. These differences of politics remained in stark evidence later in the decade when the radicalism of the sixties was in full effect, and will be returned to again in respect of Huddleston and Ramsey's involvement with the 1969 WCC Consultation on White Racism.

Conclusion

What these texts and statements reveal is the general sea change in social consciousness throughout the sixties. Elite white Christians began, at the end of the 1950s, with a racist paternalism coupled with a moral and/or intellectual sense that racism or racial prejudice was wrong. However, at the same time, there was a social, emotional, and physical need to reinforce boundaries between themselves and people whom they perceived as fundamentally 'other' by way of prohibitions on 'intermarriage'. This confusion between the oneness and universality of Christianity, coupled with a fundamental sense of difference, led to the confusion over the simultaneous affirmations and denials of 'race', as well as its transformation into other categories such as 'civilisation', 'culture', 'stock', 'ethnicity', and so on. However, by the end of the sixties, radicalism had

244 Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, p. 45.

become as much a part of some Christian organisations and communities, as it had in some aspects of society at large. Indeed, there is evidence of consensus with some aspects of secular or Marxist black radicalism of the mid- to late-sixties, particularly in the case of the WCC and the position of Bishop Wilfred Wood and his co-author Revd John Downing.²⁴⁵ These texts therefore offer the reader a variety of frameworks through which Christians conceptualised and vocalised 'race' and 'race relations' in this decade. What the next chapter offers is a particular story of how one Christian community lived and acted out these various ideas.

Perhaps the most interesting point of note to an historian is the differing ways in which history and the memory and practise of Empire was used and invoked by Christians throughout the sixties. At the beginning of the decade, liberals used Empire to define bodies and relationships, to explain location, and to define boundaries. Here the colonial presence was used as an explanatory framework to define and make sense of the present: it was a useful and useable present, even when it was past. By which it is meant that colonial mentalities were still considered useful and helpful for understanding the changes English society was going through in a positive sense. The colonial past and its terms of reference were therefore brought into the present as part of it: there was no rupture, although perhaps some fracturing in part. In contrast, the end of the decade brought with it an oppositional and radical use of this same history, which was now more truly history, more truly past. Here, the colonial 'past' was still a framework with which to make sense of the present: it was still a useful and useable history in that respect, but now it was behind the speaker, behind the nation, in the past. A rupture had occurred, a line had been delineated; so whilst this colonial history could explain and describe the way *into* the present, it could no longer be allowed to construct the present nor illuminate the way forward to a new world.

245 See the following for more on secular or Marxist black radicalism: Sivanandan, 'From Resistance to Rebellion'. Waters, 'Imagining Britain through Radical Blackness'. Bunce and Field, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain'. Angelo, 'The Black Panthers in London'.

Chapter Two: The Notting Hill Methodist Church –

A Church in the World

Having seen in the previous chapter how Christians were generally approaching 'race' and 'race relations' during the sixties, and having some understanding of the situation in Notting Hill in the late fifties, we come now to insert into the picture the activities of the Notting Hill Methodist Church on Lancaster Road, London, W11. As was noted in the previous chapter, the influential *Colour and Citizenship* report listed individual work by ministers at the parish level as one of the four main lines of Christian activity in the field of 'race relations'. As such, this chapter represents a detailed study of this line of activity by a Team Ministry based at a particular London church. The Notting Hill Methodist Church (NHMC), or the Lancaster Road Church as it is sometimes referred to, is remembered by local residents as being one of the first organisations to begin to do something to address 'race' and 'race relations' in the moments following the white violence of 1958.²⁴⁶ As Chris Holmes, a former director of the charity Shelter said, because of the different avenues of work the church undertook, 'It achieved widespread recognition as an example of successful renewal of the church in a multi-racial, inner city area'.²⁴⁷

Both the Institute of Race Relations' *Colour and Citizenship* report and Sheila Patterson's *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain* were of the opinion that the churches which were most effective in attracting black parishioners were in fact those which had a multifaceted approach to community life, and which therefore ran many essential services and activities alongside the regular church services. The positive effect of this type of approach was also confirmed by the work that the Congregationalist minister Clifford Hill was doing in Tottenham which saw him undertaking personal visits, educating 'the host community', using baptisms and weddings as a point of contact, setting up house churches, and also as having the flexibility and willingness to change his church and services. These actions, and more, were all undertaken by the Team Ministry who saw the Lancaster Road Church 'as an action station from which

246 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 372. Whetlor, *The Story of Notting Dale*, pp. 78–79. Miranda Davies and Sarah Anderson with Annabel Hendry, *Inside Notting Hill* (London: Portobello Publishing, 2001), pp. 130, 176. WCC, 4223.0.03, Letter from Donald Chesworth to Daisuke Kitagawa, 17 August 1962.

247 Chris Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill* (Studley: Brewin Books, 2005), p. 6.

they operate[d] and serve[d] the neighbourhood'. They therefore ensured that the church office was open daily so that they could be available and responsive to the myriad ad-hoc community needs which would arise. Moreover, rather than predetermined committees and meetings, the ministers met only when necessary and instead funnelled their time and energy into the specific challenges that residents faced. This way of approaching ministry was unorthodox and unusual, but the atypical nature of their approach serves as an interesting story not only in its own right, but also for organisations today, Christian or otherwise, who seek to embed themselves into the lives of a particular community.²⁴⁸

This chapter will set out the radical changes which were brought to the Lancaster Road Church by the installation of the Team Ministry in 1960. It will give the composition of the Team Ministry in terms of the three ministers involved, their inspiration for the Team Ministry, the theological rooting of it, and other groups and figures who were foundational to the experiment. Following on from this there will be a discussion of the congregation, or laity; and finally some detail will be given of the specific changes and activities the ministers implemented which had an aspect of 'race relations'. The particular activities chosen for discussion are some of those which were designed to adjust the church's practises to be in line with the needs of black Christians. In essence, this chapter is about the relationship of the church with itself: the ministers' relationships with their congregation, and their wider community contacts. Whilst there is a necessary amount of general history involved in explaining what was different about this church and its ministry, wherever possible and relevant, our attention shall always be called back to how the ministers conceived of, and practised, 'race' and 'race relations'.²⁴⁹

Planning the Group Ministry: The East Harlem Protestant Parish, Donald Soper, and the Methodist Renewal Group

The idea for starting a Group Ministry in Britain was conceived of some time before the white violence of 1958, but yet it is precisely this event which brought

248 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 373. Patterson, *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain*, pp. 331–334. Hill, *West Indian Migrants*. 'It All Began at the Bristol Conference. The Gospel, in 20th Century Terms, for Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 7 July 1964, p. 7.

249 The general history is also necessary to understand the relevancy of other bodies the ministers set up, which are the subject of Chapters Four and Six.

the experiment to Notting Hill as opposed to elsewhere.²⁵⁰ The Team Ministry consisted of three core ministers – Geoffrey Ainger, Norwyn Denny, and David Mason – the former of whom had spent time in the USA at the East Harlem Protestant Parish Group Ministry (EHPP) from 1956 to 1958. In a letter home to Norwyn Denny in the November of 1956, Ainger made reference to the idea of a 'community ministry' in a British inner-city area, and asked whether it would be possible or desirable to set one up. This preliminary idea morphed into an actual plan during a visit by David Mason to Geoffrey Ainger in 1957. After finishing up his postgraduate degree in Social Ethics at Boston University School of Theology, Mason stayed at various addresses in East Harlem to see the work Ainger was engaged in at the EHPP. Upon Mason's return to England, the trio entered into group correspondence and, once Ainger had also returned, they organised small group meetings with other Methodists to further discuss the ideas and turn them into a working plan.²⁵¹

Like many 'race relations' projects of the 1960s, the roots of the Notting Hill experiment are located firmly in the USA, and specifically in the work of the EHPP. Interestingly, as if to underscore the transatlantic nature of the inspiration, the main text about the EHPP was written by Revd Bruce Kenrick, an English minister and social activist who spent time in East Harlem in 1954-55 and 1960, and who later became part of the wider Group Ministry in Notting Hill. Kenrick's work on the East Harlem Protestant Parish – *Come Out the Wilderness* – was widely read on both sides of the Atlantic and translated into several languages, marking both his *emphasis*, and, at the very least, others' *interest*, in a social gospel which located Christ and Christianity in the streets. To date, it remains the key text about the East Harlem ministry.²⁵²

250 The *Team* Ministry signified the three core Methodist ministers, Ainger, Denny and Mason; whereas the *Group* Ministry signified the core team plus their wives and other involved ministers. NHMC, Church and Community Report, 1969.

251 NHMC, Letter from Geoffrey Ainger to Norwyn Denny, 6 November 1956. Letter from Norwyn Denny to David Mason and Geoffrey Ainger, 1 May 1958. Letter from Geoffrey Ainger to David Mason, 3 March 1959. Revd David Mason, Interviewed by the author, 21 January, 28 January, & 29 July 2015. See the following for more on Norwyn Denny: John Newbury, 'The Rev Norwyn Denny obituary', *Guardian*, 8 December 2010, <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/dec/08/the-rev-norwyn-denny>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

252 Bruce Kenrick is, of course, famous as the founder of Shelter and Notting Hill Housing Trust. Bruce Kenrick, *Come Out the Wilderness* (London: Collins, 1963). Mason, Interviewed by the author. Michael White, 'The Rev Bruce Kenrick', *Guardian*, 19 January 2007, <<http://www.theguardian.com/news/2007/jan/19/guardianobituaries.obituaries>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

In reading *Come Out the Wilderness* one is immediately struck by the similarities between the portrait of East Harlem, and how many social commentators saw Notting Hill in 1958. Kenrick reports on how the competition for jobs and housing caused resentment and distrust of others. On this, a September 1958 Student Christian Movement article on the EHPP authored by an English Methodist, noted how newly arrived migrants were exploited by unscrupulous landlords as they had nowhere else to go. This echoed the complaints levelled against Rachman and others in Notting Hill. As we shall see below, the achievements and activities of the EHPP were echoed in the concerns of the Group Ministry and included: helping young people, fighting police brutality, mediating tenant/landlord disputes, and getting church members involved in local politics. The importance of this kind of work should not be discounted for, as James Baldwin suggests, this kind of activity, even if it is hopeless or misguided, reminds people that they are not altogether forgotten.²⁵³

As was the case with Notting Hill, the church in East Harlem was seen as irrelevant: if God wasn't interested in worldly things, then East Harlem residents weren't interested in God. As such, the EHPP advocated a form of Christianity which saw the social as inseparable from religious concern. And with the social came a concern for politics out of the belief that, since God is concerned with the *whole* of a person, God therefore wills a just social order. Indeed, Kenrick noted that when the realities of people's needs require political engagement, 'Political neutrality was impossible. To be politically inactive was to take a firm line against those whose urgent needs demanded political change'. Finally, there was a strong emphasis on working *with* people and not *for*. The colonial aspect of working *for* people was underscored – it was considered to be a position stemming from a belief that one doesn't think a person capable or ready of holding the reins of responsibility.²⁵⁴

The role of racism in disadvantaging the inhabitants of East Harlem is implicit in

253 Kenrick, *Come Out the Wilderness*, pp. 28–34, 228–245. Edward Burgess, 'Letter on Returning from America', *Broadsheet of Christian Thought and Action*, 78 (September 1958), 15–16. Likewise, James Baldwin talks of the inferior housing for higher prices and how black Harlem residents were the last hired and the first fired. See, James Baldwin, 'The Harlem Ghetto', in *Notes of a Native Son*, by Baldwin, pp. 47–60 (pp. 47–48).

254 Kenrick, *Come Out the Wilderness*, pp. 38–40, 52–62, 92–99, 177–182, quote from p. 95. See also the following for a similar argument to Kenrick's on neutrality: Howard Zinn, 'What Is Radical History', in *The Politics of History*, by Howard Zinn (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), pp. 35–55.

Kenrick's text. Unlike sociological texts which sought to educate white people on the ways of black people, or analyse the mechanisms which created the poverty and disadvantage in the first place, Kenrick's emphasis was a theologically informed socio-historical one which recorded the collective action of the residents (although one suspects it is a slightly romanticised record). He showed the ways in which people acted to improve their lives, as well as their fights for equal treatment. Indeed, by fighting for their rights and by acting to improve their lives, he felt that people prove who they are, and also what their concerns, needs, and desires are. In this way, people educate those around them through action, not through speech. In this, one is reminded of Paul Gilroy's comments that the politics of black people are both more extensive and more modest than anti-racist politics. Gilroy further states that the elimination of racism is rarely articulated as the goal. Racism is, of course, felt not as an abstract but directly in terms of its particular expressions: inferior housing, lack of access to jobs and credit, white violence, and so forth. As such, fights against an *experience* of racism result in mobilisations along the lines of experience rather than through abstract theorisations. To return again to James Baldwin and East Harlem: 'Most of them care nothing whatever about race. They want only their proper place in the sun and the right to be left alone, like any other citizen'.²⁵⁵

Ainger's time in East Harlem was formative and it is clear that he thought deeply about the ways in which the Notting Hill experiment could improve upon the East Harlem one. Whilst he obviously agreed that the church needed to be a part of the world, he also felt that the EHPP was 'theologically indistinct' and was therefore neglecting the souls of the parishioners. He felt this was because the day-to-day work of a minister could be so removed from the pulpit, and so deeply embedded in social and political work, that they sometimes had little contact with the church. As such, one finds Ainger underscoring the need for ministers to continue to preach in order to remind themselves that they were 'sent out' by the church to do social and/or political work.²⁵⁶ Therefore, no matter

255 Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black*, pp. 148–150. Baldwin, 'Many Thousands Gone', p. 21.

256 NHMC, Geoffrey J. Ainger, Reflections on the Group Ministry of the East Harlem Protestant Parish, n.d., c. 1958. Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn Denny, 4 November 1956. Norwyn E. Denny, 'The Notting Hill Team Ministry Experiment', *Contact: Publication of Hanwell Methodist Church*, 136 (7 July 1963), 3–6.

how unusual, how political, and how radical some of the activities of Notting Hill Methodist Church and the Group Ministry were, one must always hold in mind the centrality of Christianity to the ministers' work.

To return to the plans as they unfurled in England, the three ministers submitted a proposal to the Methodist Home Mission Department in 1958. The proposal detailed the concerns of 'Methodists everywhere' for the renewal of the church, especially within the inner-city, which was a reflection of Methodism's historical emphasis upon the poor within industrial centres of Britain. The ministers also sought to place their proposal amongst other Team Ministerial experiments happening at that time such as in Paris, Chicago, Cleveland, Glasgow and, of course, East Harlem. For this team of ministers, the answer was not how to communicate the Gospel better, but how to find a way to existentially answer the question of 'what is the Gospel for us?'. In this way, they were emphasising the 'call and response' aspect of their ministry: what did their community need? How could they act on this?²⁵⁷ The authors emphasised their belief in 'action, prayer, and disciplined thought', and acknowledged their indebtedness to theologians like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, Jacques Ellul, and Hendrik Kraemer.²⁵⁸

A large part of the Team Ministry's theological basis resided in the theme of *koinonia* which they understood as a type of Christian fellowship with all possible barriers broken down between people. The ministers saw in the Gospel a partnership which involved 'money, race relationships and the furtherance of the gospel', and felt that the ministerial role should approximate the Apostolic one in the sense that they were needed for 'central teaching, breaking of bread, prayers and "fellowship"'. It was through *koinonia* that a disciplined community of ministers and their wives could best renew the church in the large inner-cities of Britain. Recognising that finances could prove a problem, the proposal suggested that it be funded through Missions, the help of interested parties they knew in England and the USA, and also by a

²⁵⁷ Whilst they do not mention him, it is likely that the Team Ministers were influenced by the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber and his book *I and Thou* which was originally published in 1923 and which foregrounded this 'call and response' relationship between God and humanity. This book was widely read by Christians in the sixties. Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, trans. by Ronald Gregor Smith (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

²⁵⁸ NHMC, Memorandum to the Home Missions Department Re A Proposed Experiment in Group Ministry, n.d., c. 1958.

commitment to personal financial hardship. Finances, they said, were not the crucial issue and shouldn't be allowed to stand in the way of the experiment.²⁵⁹

The proposal requested that the Team Ministry be placed in an area where the church had radically failed. A place where, despite the best efforts of individual ministers, the church had ceased to be an effective agent for the conversion of the neighbourhood. In this site of radical failure, the ministers hoped to be able to *restate* the traditional Methodist emphasis on the importance of the laity in the renewal of the church, by way of responding to the needs of the laity in a particular neighbourhood.²⁶⁰ In this way, as in Geoffrey Ainger's BBC sermon in 1966, the memorandum emphasised the need for the Church,

to listen for the Word of God which is being spoken to her precisely through her failure and her state of 'emptyhandedness'. [...] This listening does not, of course, counsel either despair or retreat, but a faithful using of our failure which looks to the promise of a 'newness' in our perception of the Word which will spell the renewal of the Church and the end of secular indifference.²⁶¹

In this way, alongside the *koinonia* of the ministry, the importance of the laity and their specific and localised needs formed an essential part of the ethos of the Team Ministry. How this manifested shall be shown further below. Despite their best efforts, the proposal was in fact flatly rejected in April 1959 by Leslie Davison, the Secretary of the Home Mission Department. Whilst expressing a great sympathy for the idea of a Christian fellowship, Davison explained that the Department was not convinced that the ministers' proposal was the best way of implementing it. Furthermore, the Home Mission Department refused on the grounds of cost and of the concentration of three ministers in one place, which they felt would be detrimental to the church elsewhere.²⁶²

259 For instance, Bruce Kenrick's mother donated £100 to the Group Ministry in October 1960. That would be approximately £2,057 in 2014. Figure obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn and Ellen Denny, 24 October 1960. Memorandum to the Home Missions Department Re A Proposed Experiment in Group Ministry, n.d., c. 1958.

260 In this, they echo the concerns of the Anglicans that Brewitt-Taylor writes about in his "Christian Radicalism" and 'The Invention of a "Secular Society"?'.

261 NHMC, Memorandum to the Home Missions Department Re A Proposed Experiment in Group Ministry, n.d., c. 1958, emphasis theirs. See also: NHMC, 'The Church Inside Out: A Pulpit Put Outside by Revd. Geoffrey Ainger from the Notting Hill Methodist Church', *People's Service*, BBC Light Programme, 23 October 1966. All three ministers led a service broadcast by the BBC in October 1966.

262 NHMC, Letter from Geoffrey Ainger to David Mason and Norwyn Denny, 21 April 1959. Draft Letter from Geoffrey Ainger to Leslie Davison, n.d. c. April 1959. Letter from Geoffrey Ainger to David Mason and Norwyn Denny, 26 November 1958. Stephen Duckworth, Interviewed by the author, 13 August 2015.

It is approximately at this time that Notting Hill comes to figure into the story owing to the figures of Donald Chesworth and Donald Soper. Donald Chesworth was a Labour member of the London County Council (LCC) for North Kensington who had been working to alleviate the housing problems of the area since the late-fifties.²⁶³ Even though himself an agnostic, Chesworth was one of the many people who called for strong Christian social action after the riots, and for a community church which could respond swiftly *and* effectively to the needs of the area. As such, Chesworth approached Donald Soper, whom he already knew through the LCC, with his concerns for the area. Chesworth described Soper's interest in the area as 'immediate and complete'. Certainly by 22 May 1959, Soper had visited Notting Hill and found the housing situation there so bad that he wrote a strongly worded letter to *The Times* demanding that Kensington Council act to take cases of rent extortion and slum conditions to the Rent Tribunal itself.²⁶⁴

Soper was a passionate and prominent Methodist Christian Socialist who was deeply concerned with many issues of social justice, including racism. Soper was also Mason's mentor and the person whom Mason came to Christianity through. Soper is famous for his open air speeches, especially his regular preaching at Tower Hill and Hyde Park, and he rooted his love of public speaking in witnessing his mother come alive through her participation in her local suffragette society.²⁶⁵ Owing to Soper's position within the Methodist church, he was to prove a vital and *receptive* source of power and authority for the Team Ministers. In fact, it was Soper's influence which ensured the proposals eventually put forward by the Revds Ainger, Denny, and Mason would come to pass.²⁶⁶

During the Methodist Conference in July 1959, Soper made what Brian Frost

263 See Chapters Three and Four for more on housing.

264 Chesworth first sought the involvement of Trevor Huddleston who was living in the area at the time. However, Huddleston's sudden election to Bishop of Masasi ended his involvement in Notting Hill. DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 8–9. Donald Soper, 'North Kensington's Problem', *The Times*, 23 May 1959, p. 7.

265 Rupert Davies has said, 'To the British public at large, Methodist social and political witness was for many years personified in Donald (later Lord) Soper'. Davies, 'Since 1932', p. 370. Brian Frost, *Goodwill on Fire: Donald Soper's Life and Mission* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996), p. 5. Brian Frost was also the Director of the Ecumenical Centre set up by the Team Ministry. See Chapter Six for more detail.

266 Mason, Interviewed by the author.

has called a 'pungent speech' on the situation in Notting Hill.²⁶⁷ Soper commented on the 'total inadequacy of the apparatus of the Church as an instrument for evangelism' and stated that Methodism must be prepared to work in the secular fields to deal with the problems of the area. He suggested social centres run by Methodists – lay and clergy – as a way of creating a type of fellowship with a wider community.²⁶⁸ Importantly for Soper, these endeavours were to be run without any suggestion of Christian piety as he believed that the Church was regarded as an irrelevant institution by the wider community and 'as a hobby of some queer old fashioned fogies or as something to be suspected of getting at them'.²⁶⁹ As such, whatever venture was undertaken, it was vital that it was not seen as a recruiting ground for the church. Soper also suggested that a coffee bar or a Christian 'community house' be set up wherein a group of Christians would live together and help create the kind of society which would lead to a flourishing and energised church. Soper impressed the need for urgent *action* over talk, and received the promise of full cooperation from those present at the Conference.²⁷⁰

The three ministers saw in Soper's speech a description of an area which matched their proposed experiment in ministry. Therefore, Mason wrote to Soper detailing the ministers' proposals and enclosed the memorandum. Mason received an enthusiastic reply from Soper within two weeks of writing, asking why he had not seen the proposal before, and asked to meet to discuss it further. As a consequence of that August meeting with Mason, Soper decided to fully back the idea of a Team Ministry, being convinced that it was the only plan of action which could work in Notting Hill. As such, the church was fairly quickly lifted out of the Bayswater circuit and into Soper's jurisdiction in order to stop

267 Frost, *Goodwill on Fire*, pp. 178–179.

268 The establishment of a social centre in Notting Hill was also suggested to Donald Chesworth by Trevor Huddleston as a possible solution to the social problems the area faced. DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962.

269 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 9. See also, Norwyn Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill', *The Kingdom Overseas*, April 1967, 14–20. 'Conference: Concern about race strife in London. "Secular" Community Centre proposed for Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 16 July 1959, p. 4. Soper quote from: 'Dr. Donald Soper and Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 30 July 1959, p. 8.

270 In fact, a Christian Community House was later set up by the Methodists in 19 Blenheim Crescent, which had previously housed the Team Ministers and their families. 'Conference: Concern about race strife in London. "Secular" Community Centre proposed for Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 16 July 1959, p. 4. 'Dr. Donald Soper and Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 30 July 1959, p. 8. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

any opposition. In December 1959, the Leaders of the Notting Hill Methodist Church were informed by Soper of the plans to redevelop their church into a church and community centre where black and white people could 'gather together'. To this end, Soper had engaged an architect and located considerable funds – between £50,000-90,000 – with which to redevelop the church, a scheme which Soper now called 'the Octagonal Settlement'.²⁷¹ From here, the plans to install a Group Ministry steamed ahead and David and Ann Mason became the first of the three couples to start work in Notting Hill in September 1960. Norwyn and Ellen Denny were to follow in September 1961, and Geoffrey and Lois Ainger in September 1962.²⁷²

However, there were two problems with Soper's plans for the 'Octagonal Settlement'. Firstly, despite his effective ultimatum – it was this church or he would build another in the area – there was still some questioning by the white church leaders over whether a scheme to 'bring black and white folk together' would even work. This indicates the relative strength of the boundaries which were perceived as dividing the white congregation from their black neighbours in the late fifties and early sixties. In fact, the Trustees originally requested that the church and the community centre be run separately, both from a financial *and* a physical perspective. In a letter to the Dennys, Ainger cynically noted how the Trustees wanted 'a smaller, modern church which would not cost so much to run and which would be sealed off from "the darkies" [...] who would be free to inhabit the secular community centre'.²⁷³ This segregation was vehemently opposed by all ministers, including Soper, who told the church leaders that he was prepared to risk the failure of the multi-racial venture in order to at least *try* to do something about 'this very complex matter'. Inevitably, the church unanimously decided to adopt the scheme as articulated by Soper, as they understood that the construction of a new church would leave them struggling

271 That would be approximately £1,039,000–£1,870,000 in 2014. Figure obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

272 London Metropolitan Archives (LMA), LMA/4451/06/009, Minutes of the Leaders Meeting Held on 10 December 1959 in the Fellowship Room. LMA/4451/06/004, Special Trustees Meeting Held At Lancaster Road Methodist Church on Monday 7 December 1959. NHMC, Letter from David Mason to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 22 July 1959. Letter from David Mason to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 5 August 1959. Letter from David Mason to Geoff & Lois Ainger, 18 November 1959. Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 25 November 1959. Letter from David Mason to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 13 March 1960. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 9, 12. Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill'.

273 NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 25 November 1959, emphasis his.

for existence.²⁷⁴

The second problem was that Soper's 'Octagonal Settlement' was not precisely what the three ministers had in mind. Not only did they baulk at the wastefulness of spending £90,000 on a building, but they were also unhappy about a building being the site of principal action.²⁷⁵ Indeed, they were so unhappy that Ainger was to privately state that 'Soper hasn't a clue of what we are after and is in fact yet one more incredibly striking example of the present malaise which is gripping the whole leadership of Methodism. He obviously hasn't read a theological book for at least twenty-five years'.²⁷⁶ The ministers had attempted to convey the wish to first *listen* to the needs of the community that they were there to serve *before* acting. It is clear that, in this respect, they themselves felt unheard. The ministers felt that the construction of a building prior to their arrival would predetermine what kind of work they could engage in, thereby curbing the flexibility of action they felt to be intrinsic to the experiment. Furthermore, they felt that if a community centre and church were set up without it being requested by the local community, it could also underscore a division between the sacred and the secular and foster a type of isolationism between the congregation and the rest of the neighbourhood. They were also concerned that any redevelopment of the church building would be seen as 'bait' to entrap people into attending church or coming to Christianity more fully.²⁷⁷

The ministers felt strongly that the previous twenty years pattern of church building and re-building in areas of perceived need was part of what ailed the church.²⁷⁸ They believed that the process should be inverted: that *people*, church-goers and otherwise, should be the primary focus of church action. They said, 'In other words people must fetch a building, if and when it becomes

274 LMA, LMA/4451/06/009, Minutes of the Leaders Meeting Held on the 10 December 1959 in the Fellowship Room. LMA/4451/06/004, Special Trustees Meeting Held At Lancaster Road Methodist Church on Monday 7 December 1959.

275 Spending large sums of money in order to finance Group Ministerial activities was also an aspect of critique that Ainger had regarding the East Harlem Protestant Parish. NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn Denny, 4 November 1956. Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 25 November 1959.

276 NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 25 November 1959.

277 NHMC, Draft Letter to Donald Soper, n.d. Letter from David Mason to Geoff & Lois Ainger and Norwyn & Ellen Denny, 31 March 1960. Similarly, the Methodist Revd Leslie Weatherhead also complained of the advertisement of 'coffee and cakes' after church services as being 'bait'. He saw them as implying that there was a 'nasty bit' of church service to get through, after which people could enjoy themselves with some refreshments. 'Not Right To Use Church Clubs As "Bait"', *Manchester Guardian*, 19 November 1958, p. 5.

278 On this see also the discussion in the Introduction and references in n. 121.

absolutely necessary, and not before'.²⁷⁹ It was part of their philosophy of 'empty-handedness' which meant that they saw buildings, and the expense of their upkeep, as being a hindrance to Christian mission. They argued that money should be spent on ministers so that they could spread out into the community by way of house churches and other activities in order to further the church's work. Buildings were a hindrance since they drained money away from this 'mobility of mission'. The ministers saw the real task of the church to be one of learning, and this was 'not done by fabric and erections of any kind of church building, but by people'.²⁸⁰ They also believed that this approach would help to attract more young people to the ministry, since 'Where there is real and worthwhile work to do, there is no shortage of young volunteers to do it'.²⁸¹

Alongside the importance of Donald Soper in securing them the church in Notting Hill, and Ainger and Mason's experiences in East Harlem as a framework for the proposal, was the Group Ministry's ongoing involvement with the Methodist Renewal Group. The Renewal Group was founded in January 1961 in Birmingham and can be seen as part of the wider movement of radical theology which John Robinson's *Honest to God* unleashed.²⁸² The group rooted themselves in a 'common concern about the deadness of much Church life, and its irrelevance to the world; the lack of radical thought or action to deal with this; and the failure to learn from the great movements of the World Church today'.²⁸³ Like the Group Ministry, the Renewal Group anchored this concern in an anger and indignation that the church seemed irrelevant to the social and political environment of the sixties, a fact they saw as being responsible for many people leaving the church. The Renewal Group was concerned with 'breaking out' into the world outside closed Christian spaces and of setting their theology amongst the critique of secular disciplines such as sociology, psychology, and education studies. It is important to not misunderstand a theology which anchored itself in the world as a form of secular humanism. The Group saw

279 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 37.

280 NHMC, *Money into Men*, n.d., emphasis theirs.

281 *Ibid.*. See also, Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 37–38.

282 John Vincent, 'Good seed: Stony ground?', in *Beware The Church*, ed. by John M. Waterhouse (London: Epworth Press, 1968), pp. 7–19 (p. 7). *Beware The Church* was an edited volume published by members of the Renewal Group as a way of explaining the aims and objectives of the Group. Rupert E. Davies, *Methodism* (London: Epworth Press, 1963, repr. 1976), p. 166. John A.T. Robinson, *Honest to God* (London: SCM Press, 1963).

283 Vincent, 'Good seed', p. 8.

themselves as seeking 'a position which utilises the distinctive things of Christ, but which elicits from them radically new patterns of secular obedience for life today'. Having made this caveat, it was also true that there was an awareness that this questioning could produce either a new form of Christianity suitable for the new age, or lead to the end of Christianity altogether.²⁸⁴

Many scholars cite the sixties as a turning point in Christianity: as the decade it died, or entered a crisis, or declined to the point of irrelevancy.²⁸⁵ However, as Jane Garnett *et. al.* suggest, it is much more profitable to think of Christianity in Britain as having changed or transformed into a dialogue with the surrounding cultures of contemporary Britain.²⁸⁶ It is important to remember that the sixties were a decade of questioning and change more generally, so this questioning of Christianity coupled with its restatement in the social environment by certain churches and Christians needs to be understood in this context.²⁸⁷ It was also a way of reinvigorating and reformulating the social gospel which was seen as too utopian in its original form, and of intersecting that with team ministries and programmes of industrial and inner-city renewal.²⁸⁸ It is also interesting to note that as the churches' traditional role of providing welfare assistance to society had been overtaken by State provision in the post-war era, that some Christians, including those of the Lancaster Road Church, were seeking other ways of embedding themselves back into this sector.²⁸⁹

As Geoffrey Ainger himself noted, 'the truly characteristic men of our time are the revolutionaries and Christians must be prepared to battle over the proper definition of that term. Who is the true Revolutionary?'. The answer, of course, was Jesus. Jesus the freedom fighter, the revolutionary, the secular believer,

284 Vincent, 'Good seed', pp. 7–19, quote from p. 15.

285 McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s*. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain*. Green, *The Passing of Protestant England*. Brown, *Religion and Society*. Bruce, *Religion in Modern Britain*.

286 Garnett, *et. al.*, 'Introduction', pp. 9–14.

287 Brian Frost, Interviewed by the author, 25 October 2015. This restatement was exemplified most famously in the work of John Robinson and, of course, Vatican II. See, for instance, Robinson, *Honest to God*. See the following for a study of how Christians restated themselves and their relationship to the world: Brewitt-Taylor, "'Christian Radicalism'". The following article also discusses this restatement in an Anglican setting: Edward B. Fiske, 'Public Apathy Creating Crisis in Church of England', *The New York Times*, 15 September 1968, p. 1.

288 NHMC, *Sources of Direction*, n.d., c. 1962.

289 Prochaska, *Christianity and Social Service*, pp. 150–160. Rupert Davies also talks of how the State control of education negatively affected the Methodist community in terms of membership in his: *Methodism*, pp. 154–155; and his, 'Since 1932', p. 365.

the 'Palestinian Tom Jones, a highly irresponsible, even disreputable young man'.²⁹⁰ Rather than just defending and restating Christianity, Ainger was also fighting back against prevailing notions that revolutionaries come from everywhere *other* than the church. It was therefore *the church itself* that he wanted to protect and he tried to show his contemporaries how the church as an institution was a positive force for change.²⁹¹ He observed,

the English, certainly, pay high regard to Jesus, but think of the Church either as a kind of parson's trade union or as a network of Saxon and Gothic structures which have become part of our national heritage and are to be visited fairly avidly, except during service time.²⁹²

For Ainger, belief in Jesus and Christian teachings was not enough: one needed to have an active involvement with a church community.

Whilst the Team Ministerial experiment wasn't initially conceived of as a specifically 'race relations' endeavour, the white racist violence of 1958, and the subsequent murder of Kelso Cochrane in May 1959, caused the ministers to embark on the experiment in Notting Hill as opposed to elsewhere.

Furthermore, that church building in particular was important as it was perfectly located at the convergence of five busy roads in what was, effectively, the heart of Notting Hill.²⁹³ As we have seen above, central to the ministers' philosophy of 'empty-handedness' was the requirement that they responded to the needs of their immediate environment. Given the prevalence of racism and racist violence in Notting Hill at that time, 'race relations' was therefore something they prioritised in their response to the neighbourhood, and something which remained a priority throughout the 1960s, although perhaps with greater and lesser emphasis at different moments in time.²⁹⁴

The Team and Group Ministry

As was noted above, it was Geoff Ainger's experiences as a member of the EHPP group ministry which initially inspired he and David Mason to conceive of a similar project in Britain. As is to be expected, a premise of the group ministry in East Harlem (and more generally speaking) was that, on top of the fact that

290 Geoffrey Ainger, *Jesus Our Contemporary* (London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 44.

291 *Ibid.*, pp. 34–44.

292 *Ibid.*, p. 85.

293 Road layouts have since somewhat changed. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

294 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 9–10. Mason, Interviewed by the author. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Notting Hill Social Council Conference, 20 April 1970.

there was simply too much work for one minister to do, a group of ministers would in fact bring a variety of talents to the project. To wit, since each of the ministers had a different background in terms of ministerial experience, they used this as a marker for the gestalt nature of their combined work: Mason with his background in city ministerial roles, Denny with his four-year ministerial experience in Jamaica, and Ainger with two years in the EHPP. Together they believed they had the nous to embark on this radical revision of a Methodist community.²⁹⁵

Reflecting on his East Harlem experiences led Ainger to go further than a simple acknowledgement of each ministers' gifts and backgrounds in his recommendations for the Team Ministry in Notting Hill. Namely he stated that there should be a semi-formalisation of the 'discipline' of each minister so that they would each have a specific area of focus.²⁹⁶ This was so that 'The diversity of gifts and interests would lead to a deeper and wider understanding of the situation in which they found themselves and allow of specialisation in one aspect of the work and the widening of contacts'.²⁹⁷ This specialisation was also advocated by other members of the Renewal Group who felt that the complexity of modern life meant that no *one* minister could be knowledgeable about all spheres of life. In the context of Notting Hill, this effectively meant that, not only was the geographical area of Notting Hill divided between the three ministers in terms of pastoral care, but that the work of the church was divided up into three main lines of activity, each corresponding with an area of interest of a particular minister.²⁹⁸

The first, under the care of David Mason, was social and political involvement. Since the ministers felt that the local communities had been badly served by the church, they pledged their allegiance to the wider groups of people of Notting

295 However, in socio-economic terms, they were all middle-class, white, heterosexual males. NHMC, Memorandum to the Home Missions Department Re A Proposed Experiment in Group Ministry, n.d., c. 1958. Norwyn Denny, 'A Servant Community', draft article for *A Kingdom Overseas*, n.d., c. 1967. Kenrick, *Come Out the Wilderness*, pp. 147–154.

296 NHMC, Geoffrey J. Ainger, Reflections on the Group Ministry of the East Harlem Protestant Parish, n.d., c. 1958.

297 NHMC, Report on a meeting held at 36, Lime Tree Ave., Peterborough, from 15-18 July 1958, by the ministers and their wives.

298 Brian Duckworth, 'Mission and Evangelism', in *Beware The Church*, ed. by Waterhouse, pp. 20–36 (p. 27). For more on the geographical divisions, see the section on the Neighbourhood Councils below. Also: 'The Notting Hill Experiment: Formation of Team Ministry', *Methodist Recorder*, 25 May 1961, p. 3.

Hill through Mason's work, rather than to the church body itself. This line of activity was shown by the establishment of the Notting Hill Social Council and all of its associated 'spin-off' endeavours as will be discussed in Chapter Four. This entailed a new attitude towards *how* the church worked and saw Mason become involved in social, welfare, and educational coalition work alongside other organisations. It is interesting to note that by not focusing specifically on the preservation and growth of the closed church community, the ministers were nevertheless able to successfully grow it through their activities elsewhere.²⁹⁹

The second avenue, under the guardianship of Norwyn Denny, was pastoral care. This was expressed through the establishment of Neighbourhood Councils which they saw as community care in a general sense as it involved the entire Community List of the church, rather than just the congregation.³⁰⁰ In addition, on a secondary level, pastoral work meant ministerial contact with local people in order to increase church membership and to bring them more fully into the life of the church. The final line of activity was one of outreach and experiment and was managed by Geoffrey Ainger. This area mainly involved experiments in worship, the development of the music group, putting on plays, the establishment, and nurturing, of house churches, and responsibility for the Ecumenical Centre.³⁰¹ All of these areas will be discussed in the Church Actions section below, aside from the Ecumenical Centre, which is the subject of Chapter Six.

These three specialisations can also be witnessed in the books produced by the ministers. Geoffrey Ainger's *Jesus Our Contemporary* sets out the figure of Jesus in new terms based on his experiences as a part of the the EHPP and the Notting Hill Group Ministry. Here we find descriptions of his experimental worship and, as noted above, portraits of Jesus as a revolutionary. It was, first and foremost, a restatement of Christianity in order to situate it in line with contemporary 'secular' society. As well as contributing a chapter on pastoral care to the *Beware The Church* book on the Methodist Renewal Group, Norwyn

299 NHMC, Norwyn Denny, The Notting Hill Team Ministry Experiment, n.d., c. 1963. Norwyn Denny, 'A Servant Community', draft article for *A Kingdom Overseas*, n.d., c. 1967. Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill'.

300 See below for definitions of different Lists and associated membership numbers.

301 NHMC, Norwyn Denny, The Notting Hill Team Ministry Experiment, n.d., c. 1963. Norwyn Denny, 'A Servant Community', draft article for *A Kingdom Overseas*, n.d., c. 1967. Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill'.

Denny also published an entire study book on the subject, again rooted in his Notting Hill experiences, giving a modern interpretation on the varieties of care a pastor may undertake. Finally, whilst credited to all three ministers, David Mason edited a book which placed the experiment of the Group Ministry firmly within the socio-political environment of Notting Hill.³⁰²

Whilst Ainger, Denny, and Mason were the three core ministers to the *Team Ministry*, there were other Christian ministers involved to various degrees as part of the wider *Group Ministry*.³⁰³ The involvement of various denominations within Group Ministries was seen as a form of 'applied ecumenicity': the World Council of Churches ecumenical conversation applied at the parish level.³⁰⁴ As such, there were at least two Anglicans (one of whom was Ken Bartlett), a Baptist Deaconess, and three Presbyterians.³⁰⁵ Of the Presbyterians, the prominent Church of Scotland minister Bruce Kenrick was one. Bruce Kenrick and his wife, Isabel, had first visited Notting Hill with Ainger in 1960, and they eventually moved to Notting Hill from Iona in late 1962 in order to be a part of the Group Ministry, albeit it on an informal level. In fact, discussions regarding Kenrick becoming a more formal member of the ministry were complicated by differing conceptions of what his ministerial duties would be. Kenrick saw it as his writing and housing work, but the Group Ministry felt that was secondary and a luxury, and emphasised pastoral responsibilities instead.³⁰⁶

It is not hard to see why Kenrick felt his housing interest to be so important

302 Ainger, *Jesus Our Contemporary*. Norwyn Denny, 'Learning to Care', in *Beware The Church*, ed. by Waterhouse, pp. 48–66. Norwyn Denny, *Caring: The Pastoral Ministry of the Christian Community* (London: Epworth Press, 1976). Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*.

303 See n. 250 above.

304 NHMC, Geoffrey J. Ainger, *Reflections on the Group Ministry of the East Harlem Protestant Parish*, n.d., c. 1958.

305 This is much smaller than the size of the EHPP ministry, which in 1956 had ten full-time members, plus one lawyer, a part-time nurse, a lay pastor, office staff, and 15 theological students who worked there part-time doing 'field work'. This difference in size reflects the relative power of Christianity in the USA *vis-à-vis* England at this time, not to mention the far larger sums of money invested in EHPP. Ken Bartlett was chair of Paddington Christian Aid, founder Director of Paddington Churches Housing Association (1966-1979) and also a trustee and chairman of Shelter (1971-1974). NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn Denny, 4 November 1956. Untitled four-page document detailing the history of the Group Ministry, n.d., c. 1972.

306 However, by 1968 and perhaps due to the success of the Notting Hill Housing Trust, Denny appears to have changed his mind on this issue as he wrote that the work of housing trusts constituted an important aspect of pastoral care. NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Stoke and Soke (aka David Mason and Norwyn Denny), 12 January 1960. Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1962. Minutes of the Group Ministry Meeting, 23 April 1963. Letter from Bruce and Isabel Kenrick to Norwyn Denny, 4 April 1964. Letter from Bruce and Isabel Kenrick to Norwyn Denny, 20 April 1964. Denny, 'Learning to Care', p. 53.

since, by April 1963 – that is less than 6 months after he had arrived in Notting Hill – he had been offered £50,000 by Christian Aid to buy up six or seven houses to renovate for families in need.³⁰⁷ The Group Ministry had agreed to get advice on it, including talking to Canon Collins and the Secretary of Kensington Housing Trust. Yet Kenrick steamed ahead with the plans and by September 1963, he reported that Christian Aid were cooperating in 'a big way' with his scheme (aka the Notting Hill Housing Trust), and he proposed that members of the Notting Hill Social Council become sponsors of it, as well as assist him in the selection of tenants. By November 1963, David Mason, Donald Chesworth, and the Rev Mother of the Little Sisters of the Assumption (a convent in Notting Hill) were on board as members of the Advisory Committee, with Pansy Jeffrey joining the Management Committee in March 1964, by which time the first house had already been purchased. Kenrick was not slow to act.³⁰⁸

The concept of a Team or Group Ministry was an exciting one for the Methodist Church; as such, in 1959 the church affirmed that Team Ministries were to be one of the main priorities for Methodism in the sixties. Over the course of the decade, several Team Ministries were set up around the country, from Leeds to Bristol to Barking, although the Notting Hill experiment proved the most important of them all.³⁰⁹ As well as achieving prominence within the Methodist community, the three ministers were each invited to preach for the BBC's *People's Service* in 1966. Denny's aired first and was essentially a description of the life of the church and its members. He commented on the 'multi-racial' aspect of the congregation, how services had changed to reflect this, the social and welfare activities undertaken by the church, and a song stressing the need to offer friendship to the 'nameless man' (aka Jesus).³¹⁰ Mason's sermon

307 That would be approximately £935,100 as of 2014. Figure obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

308 NHMC, Minutes of the Group Ministry Meeting, 23 April 1963. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 30 September 1963. Statement Prepared by Bruce Kenrick at the Request of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 November 1963. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 2 March 1964. See the following for more on the NHHT: Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*. See Chapter Four for more on Pansy Jeffrey.

309 In 1968, a Team Ministry Committee was set up, convened by Geoffrey Ainger, to further investigate national work in this area. *Methodist Conference Agenda* (London: Methodist Church, 1968), pp. 25–26. Leslie Timmins, 'The Sixties: Ten Years to Grapple with Priorities', *Methodist Recorder*, 31 December 1959, p. 3. John Munsey Turner, *Modern Methodism in England: 1932-1998* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1998), p. 22.

310 Denny was also one of the three ministers involved in the Christmas 1968 BBC1 service. NHMC, 'No Outsiders Here by Revd. Norwyn Denny from the Notting Hill Methodist

detailed the demographics of Notting Hill, the necessity of engaging with politics as part of one's Christian duty, the place of the church now that the State undertook most welfare duties, the necessity of working in 'secular' organisations to do the work of Christianity, and detailed what kinds of voluntary activities church members were engaged in.³¹¹ The final sermon by Ainger was about placing the minister back amongst the congregation, of learning to listen to the congregation (and the congregation to each other), and the necessity of listening to (and really *hearing*) and loving one's neighbour in one's daily life, not just in church on Sundays.³¹²

Buried in the attic of the Lancaster Road Church is a thumbed copy of a 1963 edition of *Renewal*, a journal of the Chicago City Missionary Society. It is most likely that the Macmillens, temporary members of the Group Ministry who had spent time working in Chicago, brought it with them when they arrived that year. The journal contains an article by Martin Luther King, Jr. wherein he condemned the contemporary church for supporting the status quo, impressed the urgency of action, and also the necessity of the oppressed to demand freedom for themselves.³¹³ Significantly, and because of this it is worth quoting in length, MLK also wrote of his disappointment with the white moderate. He said,

I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the White Citizens' Council-er or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to 'order' than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says 'I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I can't agree with your methods of direct action;' who paternalistically feels

Church', *People's Service*, BBC Light Programme, 9 October 1966. 'Down to Earth, Introduced by Revd Eric Mathieson', *Seeing and Believing*, BBC 1, 22 December 1968.

311 NHMC, 'Going Out to Work by Revd. David Mason from the Notting Hill Methodist Church', *People's Service*, BBC Light Programme, 16 October 1966. One of the organisations mentioned was a 'race relations committee' which church members from Nigeria, Jamaica, India, Barbados, and Britain served on and which was probably the IRC, which is discussed in Chapter Three.

312 NHMC, 'The Church Inside Out: A Pulpit Put Outside by Revd. Geoffrey Ainger from the Notting Hill Methodist Church', *People's Service*, BBC Light Programme, 23 October 1966. All three ministers also had a member of the congregation read something out as part of the transmission: with Denny it was Nelson Charles from Sierra Leone reading from Kenrick's *Come out the Wilderness*; with Mason it was school teacher Brenda Sadler reading from John Robinson's *On Being the Church in the World* about the Gospel and politics; and with Ainger it was Karen Cox from Sweden reading from an East German pastor's account of preaching on the street during the Cold War.

313 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 58. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Easter 1964. Martin Luther King, Jr., 'Emancipation – 1963', *Renewal*, 3 (June 1963), 2–3.

that he can set the time-table for another man's freedom; who lives by the myth of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait until a 'more convenient season.' Shallow understanding from people of goodwill is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.³¹⁴

Martin Luther King, Jr., as an exemplar of the engaged Christian, was deeply important to the ministers, and in fact, Ainger used him as the example of the ideal contemporary Christian in his book.³¹⁵ Therefore, the above quote will have been important to the ministers for its content and also for the fact that it will have no doubt chimed with Geoffrey Ainger and David Mason's experiences in the EHPP which had 'rejected the path of cautious reserve in controversial matters that are of pressing concern for the community, holding that it is better to be sincerely committed and mistaken than "wisely" neutral and irrelevant'.³¹⁶ Similarly, the *Colour and Citizenship* report noted that vigorous 'race relations' workers would need to 'cross the line from adviser to protagonist'.³¹⁷ And certainly, we find the spirit of these positions in the work that the Team Ministry undertook in Notting Hill.

Since 'race relations' underpinned much of the work that the ministers did both in terms of pastoral care and welfare, and also in terms of social and political action, it is important to know what the ministers understood by that. For Denny and Ainger, their 'race relations' work was borne out mainly through their *actions* in seeking out active church membership from their Caribbean and West African neighbours, although Norwyn Denny's 1966 BBC sermon is worth mentioning here because of his attention to 'race'. Denny spoke of the *opportunity* for change, rather than the *problem* of 'race' or colour, and how the NHMC had chosen to 'use the experience and background and traditions of different nations for the production of new ways and methods fit for a united community in the 20th century'. The sermon was therefore about changing the church to reflect the needs of a neighbourhood; but fundamentally, it was also about breaking down the barriers which separated people from one another, and of making space for others. It was also about belonging, and about bringing people into the life of the church, because distinctions made between those who

314 King, Jr., 'Emancipation', p. 3.

315 Ainger, *Jesus Our Contemporary*, pp. 93–99.

316 NHMC, Letter from Geoff Ainger to Norwyn Denny, 4 November 1956.

317 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 389.

belonged and those who did not were false. Repeatedly, when calling for an end to these barriers he referred to racialised barriers alongside other barriers such as divisions between the religious and the secular, insiders and outsiders, church and community.³¹⁸

Owing to the nature of the politics of 'race' and because of the role which Mason took on within the ministry, it is through his work and words that one finds the most concrete expressions of 'race relations', as shall be shown in the chapter on the Notting Hill Social Council. When asked how he understood 'race relations' at that time, Revd Mason said,

Remember the date: it was only thirteen years after the war ended and when the race riots took place in Notting Hill, most of the immigrants had come from the Commonwealth. In the Caribbean especially, they studied in the same kind of school system as we did, even the same history, the same set books for their matriculation. Many had fought in the wars that our brothers and fathers had fought in, so it was rather odd that this animosity and antagonism had sprung up. I thought it was my job, or our job as ministers, to show how much we had in common.³¹⁹

Certainly in this respect the church served as a safe space and as a community in which people from differing 'racial', cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds could come together and to learn about one another if they proved willing. And one finds in the oral testimonies of the long-standing members, both black and white, confirmation that this was in fact achieved.³²⁰

The Laity

It was important to the ethos of the Group Ministry, and Methodism more generally, to build up the fellowship of the laity.³²¹ In order to do this, the ministers needed to get to know the local community better and they decided to do this by living close to the church and being a family amongst other families in the locale.³²² This is important as an act of intimacy and solidarity with their

318 NHMC, 'No Outsiders Here by Revd. Norwyn Denny from the Notting Hill Methodist Church', *People's Service*, BBC Light Programme, 9 October 1966.

319 Mason, Interviewed by the author.

320 In 2004, the church employed an oral historian to record the stories of several long-standing members of the church. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975.

321 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 40–41. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. NHMC, Untitled Draft Document on the History of the Group Ministry, n.d., c. 1967. Turner, *Modern Methodism*, pp. 25–26. Denny, *Caring*, p. 16. Rupert Davies says this emphasis was even more pronounced in the sixties. See his, *Methodism*, pp. 167–168.

322 Reflecting the actual composition of Notting Hill at that time, Mason recalled how he and his family had 'a clip joint on one side and prostitutes on the other. The prostitutes acted as

fellow neighbours and meant that their social and personal lives were as bound to the community as their professional ones. They shopped in the same places, their children went to the same schools as their congregation, and they generally knew the nooks and crannies and characters of the neighbourhood. For the first four or five years, the ministers all lived in the same property – 19 Blenheim Crescent – which was converted into three flats for the ministers and their families. The building was in fact procured with the assistance of Trevor Huddleston who had convinced the owner, a female Theosophist, to sell it to Soper and the West London Mission. As a part of this ethos, the ministers' wives were also included in the planning of the Group Ministry which the ministers saw as 'an insertion of the laity into the Group Ministry from the very start'.³²³ As will be shown below in the comments of the congregation and in the Church Actions section, this aspect of the ministry was a resounding success. In fact, a 1968 report by German and Dutch ministers and sociologists who had visited various churches in the UK, commented both on the internationalist perspective of the Notting Hill Group Ministry and also on the fact that there was a high degree of lay participation in services, especially through the more experimental forms of worship.³²⁴

In a practical sense, the arrival of David Mason in September 1960 and the beginnings of the Group Ministry made for big changes in the life of the church. The church prior to Mason's arrival was 'a very conventional, lower middle class, middle-aged church'.³²⁵ As such, when Mason looked at what was being done by the Methodists in Notting Hill – choirs and Guild meetings – he concluded that it wasn't relevant. He said, 'What difference did it make to a poor woman who had Peter Rachman as her slum landlord that once a month the Wesley Guild listened to a talk on Christianity and Social Service?'.³²⁶ The activities of the church therefore needed to change. This shift of emphasis from

babysitters for us'. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004.

323 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 27–28.

324 NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1961. Mason, Interviewed by the author. DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962. Marlies Cremer, Report About a Study-Trip for Ministers and Sociologists from Germany and Netherlands to Study English New Towns and New Types of Team Ministry, 26 August 1968.

325 Stephen Duckworth, a member of the congregation since 1964 and treasurer of the Notting Hill Social Council agrees. Mason, Interviewed by the author. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

326 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 15.

a bounded, private community of believers to being an active servant of the community, meant embedding themselves into the life of the community in different ways. Firstly though, serving the community as a *whole*, meant reaching out to local black people to try to involve them in the life of the church.

It is clear that black people were worshipping at the church in the late fifties before the arrival of the Group Ministry. A photo from *The Methodist Recorder* in December 1958 shows the white minister, Revd Eric C. Elliott, alongside several black members of the congregation after some christenings. The Church Leaders' Meeting minutes also records some 'overseas friends'. Revd Elliott was also a member of Kensington Council's advisory committee which had been set up in 1959 after the white violence of the preceding year. Despite this, Mason clearly felt that the congregation did not adequately reflect the inhabitants of Notting Hill and so immediately after his appointment as minister, he set about trying to invite more black people to worship. Using the baptismal and wedding registers, he made a list of the names and addresses of approximately 100 people who he then set about visiting. Mason recalls people's warm responses to his visit: firstly, they were delighted that the minister from the church which had married them or baptised their baby had visited. Secondly, they'd never had a local white person come to see them at their home, so the sheer fact of his visit made an impact. Presumably Mason's offer to do shopping for the mothers with young babies also made a favourable impression.³²⁷

Therefore, by the end of 1960, of a congregation of around one hundred, sixty of those were of Caribbean or West African backgrounds. Mason recalls a huge notice board by the church on which he placed two large notices in red letters on white paper: 'This is your church'. These notices were taken literally by the residents of Notting Hill and, writing in 1967, Mason recorded that the congregation had become truly 'multi-racial'. In his *News from Notting Hill*, Mason noted that the usual approach that churches were taking at that time in respect of black Christians was to either force black people to conform to

327 Mason, Interviewed by the author. 'Photo: There was neither colour bar nor prejudice', *Methodist Recorder*, 11 December 1958, p. 10. 'Two Worlds of Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 4 June 1959, p. 1. LMA, LMA/4451/06/009, Minutes of the Leaders Meeting Held on 3 March 1958 in the Fellowship Room. These minutes mention seventeen 'friends from overseas'.

English ways of worshipping, or to have separate services specifically for Caribbean or West African people. However, the Notting Hill Methodist church took a different approach – one which can be understood as an example of the transformative aspect of solitary work – and decided to 'use the experience and background and traditions of many nations for the production of new ways and methods of worship fit for a united community in the twentieth century'. And in doing so, it was felt that the church was enhanced by the willingness of black people to share their lives with the rest of the congregation.³²⁸

Given the documented racism of churches and Christians at this time as noted in the Introduction, it is important to ask *how* the predominately white congregation responded to these changes in the life of the church. As was noted above, there was clearly a perception that racialised boundaries were difficult to bridge, probably because the construction and maintenance of them was undertaken by at least some of the white church members. Indeed, some church members, white and black, recalled some of the older white members initially having difficulties in adjusting to the black members, something which Mason rooted both in class- *and* 'race'-based prejudices. However, long standing black members such as Clare Holder, Ivan Weekes, and Gloria Williams all placed positive experiences in the Notting Hill Methodist Church against experiences of racism elsewhere in other churches, at school, or the workplace.³²⁹

Revd Denny was singled out in particular by some of the black members of the church as someone who was especially welcoming and who 'knew black

328 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 44, 55–56, quote from p. 56. David Featherstone, *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism* (London: Zed Books, 2012), p. 5.

329 Claire Holder is a barrister and was Chief Executive of the Notting Hill Carnival Trust for 13 years. Ivan Weekes later became the 'race relations' officer for the Methodist Church on a national level and held the post for 12 years. In 1991, he was also appointed Vice President of the Methodist Conference. The role of Vice President is the most senior lay position in the national Methodist church. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Audrey Jones, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Alice Priestly, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gene Martin, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Ivan Weekes, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Claire Holder, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gloria Williams, June 2004. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

people'.³³⁰ Denny had spent time working as a minister in Jamaica and noted of his time there that 'we were sent as "missionaries" thinking we were going to offer something to the Jamaican church. Instead the Jamaican church gave us an enormous amount in terms of understanding and human resource'.³³¹

Because of his time in Jamaica, Denny was to be especially concerned with reaching out to the Caribbean communities in Notting Hill. He talked of the warmth brought to the church by its black members and how much the church as a larger body, and he and his family as individuals, benefited from their presence and the variety of perspectives and worship styles brought to the church by the new members.³³²

Indeed, amidst prevailing sentiments of being welcomed, which were set in stark contrast to experiences at other churches, the overarching feeling of the black members of the church interviewed as part of its oral history project in 2004 is one of *being known*.³³³ In an often cold and hostile environment, this cannot be overstated in terms of its importance for a person, because being known is *being seen* as a whole person rather than a racialised object with black skin. Artenza Lawrence recalled how, during bouts of ill health where she was unable to attend church, Revd Denny and Sylvia Garrod (see below) would visit her. Denny would urge Mrs Lawrence to invite others in order to hold informal prayers by her bedside, so that even when housebound, she still had the community with her.³³⁴ For Claire Holder, the Notting Hill Methodist Church was one of the two main positive influences in her life (the other being her

330 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Claire Holder, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gloria Williams, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gene Martin, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Artenza Lawrence, June 2004.

331 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Norwyn and Ellen Denny, June 2004.

332 NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1961. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Norwyn and Ellen Denny, June 2004.

333 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gloria Williams, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Gene Martin, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Artenza Lawrence, June 2004.

334 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Artenza Lawrence, June 2004.

chosen profession of law). Again, the family of Revd Denny – Holder was best friends with their daughter when young – and Sylvia Garrod and her youth group were singled out as aspects of Holder's life which gave her security 'not just on a Sunday but as part of the fabric of your life on an on going basis'.³³⁵

Speaking from his experience as a Race Relations Officer for the national Methodist church, Ivan Weekes has stated that the Lancaster Road Church was atypical of Christianity and Methodism in general. For Weekes, alongside the knowledge of being welcomed was the sensation of *reassurance*. He spoke of his involvement with the church as,

An evolving process because as one went along one still had one's suspicions because having had for the previous years so many dreadful things happen to us, you didn't know who the hell you could trust, but you put one foot forward at a time. Of course it was a human thing to be like that but the credit to the leaders of the ministry was that they never once gave the impression that they were play-acting. As you went along you felt they were genuine and that then caused a number of things to coalesce.³³⁶

However, despite these members voicing positive experiences, and despite all of the work the ministers put into bringing black members into the life of the church more fully, there have been some criticisms made of the Group Ministry in respect of black leadership. For instance, both Stephen Duckworth and Revd Donald Eadie commented on the lack on leadership opportunities for black people during the sixties.³³⁷ Eadie was the minister who arrived in 1972 to replace Mason who left in that year and Ainger who left in 1971. Eadie said that, 'when I arrived the phrase was "what's white knows, what's white goes", and there were no black hands handling money in the vestry'. Eadie asserted whilst black leadership had begun by the time of his arrival, mainly due to the concerns of Norwyn Denny, it was really not until the seventies that black leadership truly developed. Eadie rooted the rise of black leadership in the breaking up of the Team Ministry: the ending of the charismatic leadership of the three ministers with Mason leaving and Ainger's breakdown meant that natural avenues and opportunities arose for black people to begin taking control

335 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Claire Holder, June 2004.

336 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Ivan Weekes, June 2004.

337 Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

of aspects of the services themselves.³³⁸

Without detracting from this criticism, one should also note that there wasn't a *complete* failure in terms of leadership opportunities: the problem was that the opportunities did not extend to the highest level of lay leadership.³³⁹ In a 1961 interview with *The Methodist Recorder*, David Mason commented that growing leaders from within the Caribbean community was proving to be difficult and slow work since only one had had a formal leadership role in the Caribbean. Likewise, Ivan Weekes recalled that ministers in the Caribbean led the congregation, but that in Notting Hill, the congregation was being trained to lead, both in the church and in the political arena, and that this wasn't easy given his experiences in Barbados. As such, towards the end of the decade, there *were* Caribbean and West African Welcome Stewards and class-leaders, and some black people were involved in doing house and Baptismal Roll visitations. Additionally, four of the eight Society Stewards (one of the higher lay offices within an individual Methodist church) were from the Caribbean and West Africa. Despite this, Stephen Duckworth's comment that more careful attention should have been paid to the incorporation of black leadership into the most important church roles does ultimately stand.³⁴⁰

In terms of membership figures and demographic composition, there were 82 *active* church members when Mason arrived in 1960, but by 1962, this figure had risen to 180. This number continued to rise throughout the decade with 240 members in 1963, 270 in 1965, 331 in 1967, 341 in 1968, and 360 in 1969. A visual and public representation of the church body – the Palm Sunday Procession – had 300 people involved in 1968.³⁴¹ This steady rise of church

338 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Donald Eadie, June 2004. Geoffrey Ainger accordingly had something of a personal crisis, ended his marriage, and stepped away from ministerial work for some years. See, Warren Bardsley, *Becoming Human: An appreciation of the life and ministry of Geoffrey Ainger* (Self-Published: Church in the Marketplace Publications, 2014), pp. 44–54.

339 Higher level tasks generally involved the handling of money. NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968.

340 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interviewed by Ivan Weekes, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Norwyn and Ellen Denny, June 2004. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 40–41. 'The Notting Hill Experiment: Formation of Team Ministry', *Methodist Recorder*, 25 May 1961, p. 3.

341 NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Pentecost 1962. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1963. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates

membership must be set in the context of an overall loss of 103,529 members for Methodism in the sixties alone.³⁴² As well as an ability to retain white members, the ministers also reported members from 'over 20 nationalities' such as people from Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Ghana, Gambia, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Malaysia, Pakistan, India, Italy, Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, and several other Caribbean countries. In a survey undertaken by the church in the early seventies, the occupational background of the church members was also incredibly varied from teachers to civil servants, nurses to social workers, architects to accountants, builders to gardeners, and even an artist and a 'demonstrator'. In seeking to explain why their church was showing an increase in membership *vis-à-vis* suburban churches, the ministers believed that it was due to the experimental and 'multi-racial' nature of the church which gave them loyal members. However, it is interesting to note that despite this steady growth, they still failed to attract the white working-class.³⁴³

As well as the active church members, the church maintained looser contact with a much larger group of people through the Community List which will be explored in the Neighbourhood Councils section below, and also with another international group of people through their Associates List. The church Associates were those who were interested in the work of the Group Ministry and therefore paid a subscription of £1 per annum to receive newsletters and other pieces of literature. The church in turn used the subscription money to fund activities and projects such as summer schools and outings, as well as to purchase equipment. This Associates List stood at 60 in 1962, 306 in 1965, and 1000 in 1968.³⁴⁴

Newsletter, Lent 1965. Church and Community Report, 1969. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, April 1968.

342 Methodism had been suffering a substantial decline in membership since the 1930s. There were 817,429 members in 1932, but only 557,249 in 1974. See, Davies, 'Since 1932', p. 363.

343 Stephen Duckworth Archives (SDA), Notting Hill Methodist Church Occupational Background Survey, n.d., c. 1972. NHMC, Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill', pp. 17–18. Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Pentecost 1962. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, April 1969.

344 NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Pentecost 1962. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Lent 1965. Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 36–37.

Church Actions: House Churches, Experimental Worship, Neighbourhood Councils, Youth Work, and the International Council

As well as reaching out generally to the West African and Caribbean people in the neighbourhood, the Group Ministry also undertook various church-specific actions which included 'race relations' and which were designed to facilitate the aims of the Group Ministry.³⁴⁵ Before detailing further, it should be noted that these weren't the only activities which the church undertook. For instance, there was Community House: a Christian commune which was located in the Blenheim Crescent property which the ministers had first lived in, and which also housed the Blenheim Project for drug users that was operated by the Notting Hill Social Council (NHSC). In keeping with the social ethos of the church, Community House residents had to pool a third of their income into a common pot and also make a commitment to having community involvement in Notting Hill. Although this experiment in Christian communal living was a predominately white undertaking, there was one black female member, Ira O'Flaherty.³⁴⁶ What follows below are certain actions which the church as a *church* undertook to deliberately reach out to, and include, a larger amount of Notting Hill residents, especially, but not only, the Caribbean and West African residents.

The house churches were small, 'multi-racial' and interdenominational or ecumenical gatherings of people in various houses in the area, and were central to the ethos of the Group Ministry as part of their belief in the ministry of the whole laity. They were considered important for two main reasons: firstly, it was a way of spreading out the church and its activities so that leaders weren't 'creamed off' onto church premises. Secondly, by getting people involved in different types of congregational meetings, the ministers were able to 'break the accepted identification of the Church in the neighbourhood with the church building on the street corner'.³⁴⁷ The ministers saw the house churches in three main ways: as an adaptation, or recovery, of the early church to contemporary society; as a method of getting to know one another in ways impossible during

³⁴⁵ This is opposed to the social activities undertaken by the Notting Hill Social Council (see Chapter Four) and the wider ecumenical project of the Ecumenical Centre (see Chapter Six).

³⁴⁶ Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. NHMC, Community House Report, 1965-1966.

³⁴⁷ Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 43-44, quote from p. 51. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

main church services; and as a way of bringing people into the wider life of the church. Whilst being initially spearheaded by the Revds Denny, Ainger and Macmillen, they also eventually served as a fruitful area in which to grow and nurture lay leadership. Importantly too, the NHMC house churches were viewed as being so successful because they offered a safe space wherein black people could discuss the problems they were facing in housing or employment and obtain help from other people present.³⁴⁸

Each house church had its own pattern and ethos, with some being more formal and/or regular than others. Emphasis varied from prayer and bible study, to general fellowship, and to social action and mutual aid. For instance, the ministers found that whilst Caribbean house churches were more devotionally orientated, preferring bible study, song and prayer; West African house churches were more politically orientated, listening to speeches by Mandela or discussing South Africa in the context of worship. The openness of the format was no doubt due to the fact that house churches did not feature in Wesley's 44 Sermons, so the practise was very much ad-hoc. However, whatever the emphasis, whatever the format, the point was to bring people together in a new set of relationships to God, themselves, and others. The house churches ran throughout the sixties, both as independent and church affiliated groups, and by 1968, they began trying to formalise them with some rules of etiquette, as well as holding a service-conference to discuss the future of them.³⁴⁹

Whilst the ministers found it difficult to establish house churches in white homes, they found that West African and Caribbean people were particularly attracted to the house churches, and through them, were drawn into the wider community of the church itself. Indeed, in the early years the ministers noted that the most successful house churches were held in the evening in the homes

348 NHMC, Sources of Direction, n.d., c. 1962. 'Melting Pot', *London Viewpoint* (London: The London Mission, 1963), pp. 22–26. Church and Community Report, 1969. Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Pentecost 1963. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, July 1964. Mason, Interviewed by the author. John M. Crosby, 'Where two or three are gathered', *Guardian*, 11 March 1965, p. 9. 'It All Began at the Bristol Conference. The Gospel, in 20th Century Terms, for Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 7 July 1964, p. 7. Patterson, *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain*, p. 334.

349 NHMC, Church Report, 1968. Church and Community Report, 1969. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Lent 1965. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, April 1968. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1968. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 43–44, quote from p. 51. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

of Caribbean people who did not, or could not, come to evening services. They cited a particular, five-storey home in Ladbroke Grove with a family in each room. Each week, a group met in a different room with fifteen to twenty people crowded in and sitting wherever they could.³⁵⁰ They noted how much the friendship group was appreciated by the participants, and that 'Half the people there do not come to Church, of the other half, perhaps 6 come regularly to the morning service, but are not keen to turn out at night. The natural habit is to stay indoors after dark – with good reason'.³⁵¹ Whilst the 'good reason' is not stated, it is most probable that it is due to continued fascist and racist agitation in Notting Hill reported in that same newsletter, and throughout the first half of the sixties in the *Kensington Post*.³⁵²

Another way in which the ministers tried to restate and reinvigorate Christianity and the church was through experimenting with different worship styles. They therefore made every third Sunday morning a 'Free Order' service during which a local person working for the welfare of the neighbourhood in some capacity was invited to speak and report on their work. For instance, this might be someone from a Family Service Unit, or a Housing Trust, or a voluntary worker with old people. Again, emphasising the Group Ministry's belief in engaging with the wider community, the participants of these services were not always church members. Experiments in evening worship also showed a desire to move

350 NHMC, Minutes of Group Ministry Meeting, 12 November 1963. Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1962. Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1961.

351 NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1962.

352 Ivan Weekes talked candidly about the effects of racism on his, and other black people's, behaviour at this time in: NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Ivan Weekes, June 2004. In addition, the ministers report on the continued violence against black people by white youths in: NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1962. See the following fraction of the *Kensington Post* articles which detailed white violence: 'Petrol Bomb Hurlled at Window', *Kensington Post*, 17 October 1958, p. 1. 'Guerilla tactics by race thugs: Attempt To Force Trader To Quit', *Kensington Post*, 26 September 1958, p. 1. 'Cafe wreckers are jailed. £180 Damage: Coloured Owner Was Beaten Up', *Kensington Post*, 20 February 1959, p. 1. 'Jamaican's Murder Starts A Social and Political Furore. "Curfew" At Notting Hill. Coloured families remain indoors. Extra Police Go in Pairs', *Kensington Post*, 22 May 1959, p. 1. '"Defence Patrols" Urged', *Kensington Post*, 22 May 1959, p. 1. 'Hunt For Youths Who Beat Up Jamaicans. One is Stabbed in the Back', *Kensington Post*, 17 April 1959, p. 1. 'P.C. Denies "beating-up" seaman. Defendant Tells Court He Was Chased, Hit With Torch', *Kensington Post*, 26 May 1961, p. 1. 'Youth Accused of Attack with Iron Bar', *Kensington Post*, 27 July 1962, p. 6. 'Gang hurl bottles at coloured students', *Kensington Post*, 19 October 1962, p. 8. 'Attack on Jamaican – Police', *Kensington Post*, 16 November 1962, p. 7. 'Coloured youths attacked by whites, say police', *Kensington Post*, 19 February 1965, p. 10. '"Shots at West Indians" - Three Accused', *Kensington Post*, 30 April 1965, p. 1. 'Coloured man is attacked in park', *Kensington Post*, 14 May 1965, p. 1.

beyond church boundaries and into the world. For instance, there was a service on homelessness in which ballads of music mixed with the pre-recorded voices of homeless Notting Hill people were used alongside a narrative from Luke. In order to try to include and interest younger people in the services, Ainger took a teenage member of the youth-club with him in order to record 'those who could speak out of their own experiences of insecurity, overcrowding, exploitation and homelessness on our streets'.³⁵³ Another service, on hunger and affluence around the world, utilised statistics on world hunger and barometers of affluence in different areas of the world, such as infant death rates, in order to highlight poverty and privilege. As a final example, they also constructed a service around 'the meaning of racial integration'. For this they used Luke 4, James Baldwin's *The Fire Next Time*, and contemporary music as the raw material from which to fashion worship out of.³⁵⁴

As well as being part of a restatement of Christianity more broadly, the experimental worship can be seen as fitting into the aims of the Methodist Renewal Group which felt that Christians shouldn't have to choose between being in the struggles of the world and being in the church. As such, they viewed the fights of Amnesty, the Peace movement, the UN, and so forth, as being sites of 'God's presence' since 'God is in the flame of protest' (although it is not clear how much overlapping membership occurred in the sixties). The Renewal Group therefore encouraged ministers to bring symbols of the world into worship in order to remind Christians of the activities of God in the world, something which was amply demonstrated in the experimental worship and new forms of music engaged in at the NHMC. The Renewal Group felt that preaching was to be the part of worship where the *real problems* of living in the world were addressed to, and answered by, the congregation.³⁵⁵

353 Ainger, *Jesus Our Contemporary*, p. 10.

354 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 51–52. Rob Waters notes Baldwin was widely read in England by 1963. However, the positive engagement with *The Fire Next Time* by the NHMC tells us that not all engagements with this text were in the negative as he suggests. See: Waters, "Britain is no longer white", pp. 716–717.

355 The Notting Hill Music Group became quite popular and received many requests for copies of their song books and records, *Songs from Notting Hill* and *More Songs from Notting Hill*, selling 6000 copies of the former in total. The group saw themselves as 'secular Christians' expressing their concerns for the world through song. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, November 1965. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1967. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Geoff Ainger, June 2004. SDA, *Songs from Notting Hill*, n.d., c. 1964. Duckworth, 'Mission and Evangelism', p. 33. See also, Ainger,

Despite trying to include West African and Caribbean people in these more experimental forms of worship, Mason noted that many of the black members did not approve. Instead, they stipulated the kinds of services they wanted and the white congregation accepted, he said, because they were intrigued. When asked if the white congregation were receptive to listening to black people in general, Mason recalled they were. He reflected,

In Notting Hill, at the local level, in conversation, local families, the husband or the wife or, indeed, one of the teenage children would say something quite penetrating, and they were indirectly educating us. It was very helpful. [...] They took it for granted that we would listen, take it seriously, and we found it very helpful to us that they felt they could make that contribution. They weren't being done good to; they were, as human beings, having their own say about what they thought should be done, and we listened. And because we listened, we learnt, and other people benefited as well.³⁵⁶

Another way in which the ministers attempted to reach more Notting Hill residents was the establishment of Neighbourhood Councils.³⁵⁷ The 'parish' was divided up into three specific areas and each minister was responsible for one of them, although overall the project was coordinated by Denny. The members of the Neighbourhood Councils were based on the church's Community List, which was a much larger list of people than the active Member List, as it included everyone the church had ever had any contact with, such as through baptism or marriage. The Neighbourhood Councils involved both black and white people and four to five times a year, people would be invited to a particular house in their ward to talk about the area and local community issues. Unfortunately, the specifics of the meetings are lost, so it is not clear what was discussed, but no doubt it will have echoed the social, welfare, and political concerns of the activities of the NHSC as shown in Chapter Four. The numbers of *families* involved with the Neighbourhood Councils grew from 530 in 1963 to 1000 in 1968; however, in 1969 it was decided to end the Councils and replace them with a similar scheme which saw the area being divided up into smaller areas, as well as introducing more specific Councils for youth, the elderly, and

Jesus Our Contemporary, pp. 13–15. Trevor Rowe, 'Worship', in *Beware The Church*, ed. by Waterhouse, pp. 37–47 (p. 40).

³⁵⁶ Mason, Interviewed by the author.

³⁵⁷ Not to be confused with the Golborne Neighbourhood Council which David Mason and the NHSC were involved with.

one with an international focus.³⁵⁸

A focus on youth work was also a significant priority for the ministers, and one in which they deliberately sought a 'multi-racial' aspect to the work and were considered successful in doing so by black members of the community. Youth work as an avenue of interest was followed through by church-specific activities as well as activities led by the NHSC such as the Portobello and Blenheim Projects as discussed in Chapter Four. There were a variety of ways in which the church engaged with local youths: from more typical activities such as Sunday schools, Brownies and Guides, Boy's Clubs, Junior Church, and Junior Missionary Associations; to educational projects such as helping with literacy and homework, and providing tutorial sessions for those who needed it. Additionally, the church ran summer schools from the Ecumenical Centre whereby a group of Christian students would be resident for two weeks of the summer holidays to undertake group activities and outings with local kids.³⁵⁹

In addition to the above, the church undertook more challenging work with older youths. And in terms of involving young black people, this is an area in which they were particularly successful. This was mainly due to the pioneering work of a woman called Sylvia Garrod who lived next-door to the church and ran a highly successful youth group for 10-17 year olds out of the church's basement. She had already begun her work by 1960, even before the arrival of David Mason, and Mason viewed her not only as a 'remarkable woman', but as the first white person to respond to the needs of local black communities. Garrod ran the youth group by herself and, initially, out of her own pocket, and many members of the church have emphasised how deeply respected she was by the youth that came.³⁶⁰

358 Since the figures cited were the total number of *families* involved, the total number of *people* would have been much higher. NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. Church and Community Report, 1969. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Lent 1965. Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Pentecost 1963. Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill'. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

359 NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. Church and Community Report, 1969. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 8 December 1967, pp. 18, 43.

360 Mason, Interviewed by the author. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Artenza Lawrence, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Claire Holder, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Donald Eadie, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea

Sylvia Garrod reported how important being with others and working with children was for her sense of self. This importance was clearly borne out in her actions, as she was praised for *being there* for both the parents and children she looked after. As well as the youth club in the church basement, Garrod held cooking classes in her home and took the young people away on trips to Germany and elsewhere.³⁶¹ It is important to note that the club ran by Garrod was mainly comprised of black teens. As was the case with the NHSC's Portobello Project (see Chapter Four), this indicates that, despite the church's and youth workers' *aims* of creating multi-racial spaces for young people, there was resistance on the part of the white youths to this, especially in the first half of the decade.³⁶² Indeed, a report on an Inters Club (pre-teen) holiday in 1964 to Wales found the white girls refusing to mix with the black boys which was attributed to 'a fear of what their friends would think'.³⁶³

Sylvia Garrod was also credited with protecting the black youth group members from police harassment by forbidding police entry to the club at a time when the police were raiding many other establishments in Notting Hill which had a significant black clientele. Whilst she was able to do this because the police somewhat respected the church as an institution (and presumably her as a white woman), it was still marked as significant and meaningful by black and white church members. Similarly, for those young black people who had been picked up by the police elsewhere, Garrod would also go to court with the families and support them in any way she could. In all, it would be difficult to

Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Francis Denny Scott, June 2004.

361 Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Sylvia Garrod, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Artenza Lawrence, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Claire Holder, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Donald Eadie, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Francis Denny Scott, June 2004. Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. Church and Community Report, 1969.

362 Francis Denny Scott, Norwyn Denny's daughter was an exception to this rule. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Francis Denny Scott, June 2004.

363 NHMC, Notting Hill Methodist Church Inters Club Holiday, Easter 1964. The holiday group was comprised of five black boys, six white boys and fourteen white girls. The report states that they were unable to attract any black girls to the club.

overstate the importance of Sylvia Garrod to the young black attendees of the youth-club and their parents.³⁶⁴

In the earlier years of the youth-club, there were problems with gangs of white youths breaking into the church premises and stealing or damaging things. The ministers reported that they were required to bar these particular young people from entering the church in order for them to be able to work with the young people who ordinarily attended. They wrote of the loneliness of these young people and how, inevitably, many would join one of the established gangs, and then 'there will be windows to smash, or motor bikes to damage, petrol bombs to throw at people, or a West Indian to beat up'. The ministers reported standing outside for hours on end arguing with the young people and how the young people needed 'a great deal of understanding and sympathy, but not softness; and patience that goes on trying to do something for them, when sense says it is useless'.³⁶⁵ Seemingly the ministers approach worked, because a year and a half later they reported that those same teenagers who had been damaging and stealing from the church were now happy and productive members of the youth club.³⁶⁶

The final church action under consideration is the International Council which was formed in May 1970 by Geoffrey Ainger. Whilst not strictly the sixties it is important to mention as it demonstrates how the later part of the 'long sixties' were to see a widening of the church members' concerns to include the world in a global sense. For instance, the International Council issued a resolution, with fierce opposition from Soper, supporting the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism's grants to liberation movements in Southern Africa.³⁶⁷ Alongside a general change in wider social tenor, this is also most

364 Mason, Interviewed by the author. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Artenza Lawrence, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Claire Holder, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Donald Eadie, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Francis Denny Scott, June 2004.

365 NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1962.

366 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Easter 1964.

367 The Haslemere Group, of which Stephen Duckworth was a member, also endorsed these grants. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. Kevin O'Sullivan, 'The Search for Justice: NGOs in Britain and Ireland and the New International Economic Order, 1962-82',

likely related to the growth of black leadership in the church. For, not only was Ivan Weekes chairman of the International Council, but the Council self-consciously rooted itself in two things: a congregation which featured people who were born, and/or had worked, overseas, and the infamy of 'inter-racial confrontation' which marked Notting Hill.³⁶⁸ As such, the International Council's aims were:

To encourage a fuller expression of national and cultural groupings within the church. To enable a larger proportion of our church community to share in current thinking on race relations. To act in liaison with the Borough Inter-Racial Council. To work together the the Church overseas (Overseas Missions). To work for reconciliation overseas (Amnesty International and East-West Contacts). To promote our church's involvement in the fight for International Economic Justice (Christian Aid).³⁶⁹

The Society was naturally concerned with South African apartheid, and as Society chairman, Ivan Weekes wrote to Norman Tebbitt in 1970 opposing the government's intention to resume the sale of arms to apartheid South Africa. Weekes wrote that the resumption of sale would give the impression that the government condoned apartheid and would thereby have a deleterious effect on 'race relations' both in Britain and in the Commonwealth. This was especially so when considered in conjunction with the further tightening of the Immigration Act, the weakening of the Race Relations Board, and concessions made to the illegal regime in Rhodesia. Tebbitt's reply to Weekes was short, amusingly terse, but also telling in its dismissive nature, he said: 'I am given to understand that there are souls to be saved in Notting Hill. I am able to inform you that the heart of the opposition to the probable arms sale to South Africa is from black racist states like Kenya and the anti-Christian Communist movements throughout the world'.³⁷⁰ In this reply there can be read an objection to a church seen to be 'meddling in politics', but this also indicated a bifurcated narrative as

Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development, 6 (2015), 173–187 (p. 177).

368 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, November 1970. SDA, The Concern of the Notting Hill Methodist Community with South Africa, n.d., c. 1973. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

369 NHMC, Church and Community Report, 1969. Had the ministers not reached out so repeatedly to non-white church members in other areas of the church, one could be concerned by the first stated aim of the International Council. As if international concerns were the proper place for the activities of black people.

370 SDA, The Concern of the Notting Hill Methodist Community with South Africa, n.d., c. 1973. NHMC, Letter from Ivan Weekes to Norman Tebbitt, n.d., c. October 1970. Letter from Norman Tebbitt to Ivan Weekes, 7 November 1970.

to how oppression, violence, aggression, and justice were understood by a member of the government *vis-à-vis* how they were understood by some anti-racist and anti-apartheid campaigners at that time.

Conclusion

If just one aspect of the Team Ministry's approach were to be singled as the keystone to the experiment that was Notting Hill, it would have to be their philosophy of 'empty-handedness'. The simplicity of this pivotal idea effectively guaranteed that the experiment would result in success, if by success we understand a church useful and relevant to the community it was there to serve. For, by having the humility to stand before the neighbourhood and ask what it needed and wanted, the ministers rooted themselves deep into the lives and aspirations of that community. In this way, by observing and listening to their community, the ministers set up activities and enacted changes which reflected what was needed by the people they were there to serve, and in doing so, the people came. Of course, the ministers were able to be so effective in this because they were three, because of the variety of skills and experiences they brought with them, and because they were unafraid to step outside of the borders of the church to affect change in the lives of the people, black and white, around them. Importantly, it was this step outside which eventually served to bring back more people inside of the boundaries of the church walls with them.

One must ask, was all this activity and change 'race relations' in a strict sense? They certainly saw it as such, but also, they saw it as so much more. They saw themselves as ministering to, and as helping to heal, a fractured and divided neighbourhood, one which was riven along many lines: social, 'racial', and economic. 'Race relations' was therefore an *essential* part of that work, but not *all* of the work. Whilst some of the actions and statements the ministers made and did might feel somewhat self-conscious to a modern reader, one must remember to set them in the context of the period and juxtapose them against dominant constructions of people of colour at that time. As such, statements which talk of 'opportunities not problems' can be seen as an act of defiance against prevailing discourses which sought to blame black people for perceived social ills in Notting Hill and elsewhere. The same can be said for self-conscious

constructions of learning from black people and changing themselves (as white people) because of that. Since, whilst Roy Jenkins famously coined the first definition of pluralism in 1966, the prevailing ideology during the sixties was one of liberal integrationism, which, for most people, black and white, *effectively* meant assimilation.³⁷¹ For instance, the WCC stated that, whilst government and major political parties had taken Roy Jenkins' pluralistic definition of integration as their line of approach, 'there is wide misconception as to its meaning and in particular, it is very commonly confused with assimilation'.³⁷²

Finally, it is also interesting to note the ways in which the ministers sought to restate *the church* as a Christian body, re-embed it in the community, and re-awaken people to its utility and meaning. They saw that it was necessary to re-engage with voluntary activities such as youth work, education, welfare and so on – the politics of everyday life – in order to remind people of the value of the church. The ministers felt themselves battling against the perceived irrelevancy of the church in the post-war period, and felt marginalised by a world which they believed needed them on a deep and integral level. In order to survive both in terms of their vocation and as a larger body, the ministers knew that the church must be more than a building and sermons: it must be part of the fabric of social life outwith the borders of the building itself. In a way, this can be viewed as the ministers pushing back against the State which had steadily taken over the traditional social and welfare roles of the churches since the end of the nineteenth century. And, of course, in terms of membership numbers and the testimony of their members, the ministers were absolutely right to do so.

371 Jenkins articulated it not as 'a flattening process of assimilation but as equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance'. As cited in, Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 25.

372 WCC, 4223.1.01, Background Statement on White Racism, Document No. 12, July 1968. See also: NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Ivan Weekes, June 2004. See also the longer discussion on this in Chapter Five.

Chapter Three: Community Action in Notting Hill

One of the most intriguing things about Notting Hill of the sixties is the extremely high levels of community action engaged in. As was shown in the Introduction, Notting Hill was a hive of social activity, illicit and otherwise, at the end of the fifties. Alongside all of that activity and social flux, especially in the second half of the sixties, was a corresponding level of political engagement. This chapter therefore explores the political and social milieu in which the Group Ministry operated in the sixties, before going on to consider the work of the wider community focused organisation – the Notting Hill Social Council – in Chapter Four. At this time, North Kensington was awash with 'do-gooders and well-wishers' of every variety.³⁷³ This was wittily summed up by *The Observer* journalist Pendennis when he said,

The district has a higher concentration of sociologists, community organisers, welfare workers, political activists, middle-class philanthropists, church missionaries and journalists than any other 1.4 square miles in the United Kingdom. It's really quite difficult to find anyone who hasn't appeared on television, or figured in a social survey or doctoral thesis.³⁷⁴

But importantly too, the residents themselves (although no strict line can be drawn between the 'do gooders' and the residents) self-organised around issues which mattered the most to them, such as housing, play-space, and 'race'.

Politics and the political is used here in the broader sense of political culture that Lawrence Black advanced in his excellent *Redefining British Politics*. Black stated that the redefinition of politics seen in the sixties was because 'Discontent with existing political structures and demands for participation generated a more pluralist political culture, mostly located outside of party'.³⁷⁵ This is a statement which stands very true for Notting Hill as the exceptionally high levels of *self-organised* community action and engagement outside the traditional party political lines, was precisely due to the failure of the local Labour Party to act as a channel through which local working-class people

373 Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, p. 182. John Davis, 'Containing Racism? The London Experience, 1957-1968', in *The Other Special Relationship*, ed. by Kelley and Tuck, pp. 125–146 (p. 126).

374 Pendennis, 'Into the urban jungle', *Observer*, 23 August 1970, p. 30.

375 Lawrence Black, *Redefining British Politics: Culture, Consumerism and Participation, 1954-1970* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), pp. 7–8.

could express their frustrations. Jan O'Malley has stated that the local Labour Party's emphasis was a tripartite one which involved 'electioneering, the discrediting of any groups which challenged the Party's position as sole representative of the working class, and individual casework'.³⁷⁶ These failures, coupled with an often hostile and negligent Conservative Borough Council, meant that local people began organising themselves in order to change their situations and lives. In doing so, they acted along the lines which mattered the most to them.

Jan O'Malley's informative book *The Politics of Community Action in Notting Hill* highlights the work of prominent white activists and organisations such as George Clarke, Rhaune Laslett, the Notting Hill People's Association (and People's Centre), Community Workshop, London Free School, Notting Hill Neighbourhood Service, and the Notting Hill Summer Project, amongst others.³⁷⁷ However, alongside these groups and people were figures like Pansy Jeffrey and Donald Chesworth, and organisations such as the Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council (IRC), and, of course, the Notting Hill Social Council (NHSC). Therefore, with the aid of local newspaper reports and a journal produced by the IRC, this chapter will focus on some of the racialised aspects of key sites of community action, including how this was constructed in the local press.

Housing Activism

Reading through editions of the *Kensington Post* from the sixties, one finds an abundance of articles relating to housing and children's play-space activism. However, as important as play-spaces are for families, as Jan O'Malley rightly says, housing issues must take precedence. This is because

they are crucial to the working class people being able to live in the area. All other struggles over play and motorway space are secondary in that they are only part of working class struggles so long as working class people continue to live in the area and so be able to make use of whatever amenities are won.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁶ Revd David Mason, a life-long Labour Party Member, also stated that it was the internecine bickering of the local Labour Party which made him decide to turn down a proposal to run as MP for North Kensington. Jan O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action: A Decade of Struggle in Notting Hill* (Nottingham: Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation for Spokesman Books, 1977), pp. 21–23, quote from pp. 21–22. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

³⁷⁷ O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

It is for this reason that housing has been chosen to discuss for this short section.³⁷⁹ Additionally, housing has been singled out since the issues surrounding it both pre-date and outlive the period of the thesis, and also because quite probably the most notorious landlord in British history – Peter Rachman – is infamous precisely because of his operations in Notting Hill, although not, as John Davis and Chris Holmes have pointed out, until after his death.³⁸⁰

Furthermore, whilst Teddy Boys and hooliganism were blamed for the white violence of 1958, especially so in respect of how the police coded the violence, many other local commentators rooted the violence in issues relating to housing.³⁸¹ Alderman Thackway of Kensington Council called this emphasis on housing an oversimplification and instead stated that 'Intolerance, lack of understanding and above all, lack of a sense of civic and personal responsibility' were the primary causes of the racialised violence in North Kensington.³⁸² Whilst there is obviously a large element of protecting the Borough's reputation in such a statement given their responsibility for maintaining adequate housing stock, there is also some truth in pointing out the

379 This is not to discount the importance of play-space activism though, for it was a perennial campaigning point for local residents from at least the late-fifties. It is also interesting in its own right in that it was often women-led and also contained racialised aspects, some of which will be discussed in the next chapter. However, brevity forces focus.

380 As it will be shown below, some local campaigners were aware of Rachman; however, Davis is right to say that Rachman's *infamy* was posthumous. John Davis, 'Rents and Race in 1960s London: New Light on Rachmanism', *Twentieth Century British History*, 12 (2001), 69–92. Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*, p. 3. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 190–198. For more on Peter Rachman see also: Shirley Green, *Rachman* (London: Joseph, 1979).

381 At first myriad 'causes' were cited: poverty, different ways of living, prostitution, vice, ignorance on the part of white people, and the absence of pride and community spirit. However, the variety of causes tended to decrease the further one got away from the event, until a housing focus eventually predominated (although sometimes jointly with employment problems). This is a small selection of the myriad *Kensington Post* articles on the matter: 'Immigrants Must Be Limited, Says M.P. "Deport Criminals"', *Kensington Post*, 5 September 1958, p. 1. "'Help to crush race hooliganism': Group Will Seek to Ease Friction', *Kensington Post*, 19 September 1958, p. 1. J. Gornham, 'Letters to the Editor: Poverty to blame', *Kensington Post*, 12 September 1958, p. 3. 'Overcrowding Blamed for Race Tension', *Kensington Post*, 26 September 1958, p. 3. 'Readers Write on the Race Riots: "Blame Living Conditions" - Labour', *Kensington Post*, 26 September 1958, p. 4. 'Coloured folk not to blame for homes shortage', *Kensington Post*, 21 November 1958, p. 8. 'L.C.C. Questions on Housing in Kensington', *Kensington Post*, 24 July 1959, p. 3. 'TV story of threats to tenants: "Silence on rents – or children will be harmed"', *Kensington Post*, 31 July 1959, p. 1. "'Bad housing affects both black and white" - Liberal', *Kensington Post*, 9 October 1959, p. 1. 'Housing is No. 1 worry', *Kensington Post*, 11 December 1959, p. 4. See also: Jim House and Andrew Thompson, 'Decolonisation, space and power: immigration, welfare and housing in Britain and France, 1945-1974', in *Writing Imperial Histories*, ed. by Andrew Thompson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 240–267). Davis, 'Containing Racism?', pp. 136–137. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 7.

382 'The real causes – by Council leader', *Kensington Post*, 5 June 1959, p. 1.

oversimplification of equating housing struggles with racist violence in a singular and linear fashion. Racism must already be present in order for the blame and resentment to be channelled along racialised lines.

Whilst monocausal analyses are never satisfactory, it is also true to say that housing and 'race' were entwined in several ways. Firstly, because of the discrimination black people faced (and continue to face) in the rental market in terms of lack of access to housing.³⁸³ Black people also faced the so-called 'colour tax' whereby when they were rented to, they were charged considerably higher rents than white tenants. Indeed, landlords were accused of creating 'little Harlems' in North Kensington due to the ways in which they were exploiting black tenants. Secondly, this discrimination often led black people to buy dilapidated homes in 'twilight areas' of the city, an action often made possible through 'pardner' systems of capital pooling. In turn, white people were often resentful of black people buying houses (even if it was of appalling standard) for two reasons: firstly, for allegedly bringing down the house prices of a neighbourhood, and secondly if it meant that their new black landlord required the house or room back in order to house their own family. A final relationship between housing and 'race' was highlighted by Archbishop Ramsey who considered housing issues to be a primary reason for the demand for the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act.³⁸⁴

383 Guy Lynn and Ed Davey, 'London letting agents "refuse black tenants"', *BBC News*, 14 October 2013, <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-24372509>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. A depressingly similar article was also published by *The Guardian* in 1976: Gillian Linscott, 'How estate agents discriminate against blacks', *Guardian*, 22 June 1976, p. 4.

384 'Pockets of Harlems in North Kens.', *Kensington Post*, 3 July 1959, p. 1. 'Warning of "Little Harlems" in W.11. Urgent Action Is Needed Says Council's Welfare Worker', *Kensington Post*, 17 January 1964, p. 1. Davis, 'Rents and Race in 1960s London'. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 120–148, 424–426. Rex, 'The Race Relations Catastrophe', pp. 72–74, 78. Hill, *Black and White in Harmony*, pp. 41–56. House and Thompson, 'Decolonisation, space and power', pp. 249–255. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 158–180. *Report by Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council*, Cmnd. 2119 (London: HMSO, 1963). "'So Sorry, No Coloured, No Children'", *West Indian Gazette*, 3 (Aug 1960), p. 5. RBKC, Box 6-G, Yvette Rochester, "'Our Saving Grace": The Importance of the 'Pardner' System in Relation to the Housing Needs of Post War West Indians in Britain", n.d., c. 2001. 'Study in Black and White – By A Minister', *Kensington Post*, 5 December 1958, p. 4. 'TV story of threats to tenants.: "Silence on rents – or children will be harmed"', *Kensington Post*, 31 July 1959, p. 1. 'Landlord tells why he paid £700 for short lease of house', *Kensington Post*, 23 March 1962, p. 9. 'Indian paid £4,650 for "hovel of house"', *Kensington Post*, 6 January 1961, p. 6. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 24 November 1967, pp. 18, 27. *Hansard*, HL Deb 12 March 1962, Vol 238, Col 26. Housing was also central to the infamous 1964 Smethwick election campaign. See: Street, 'Malcolm X'.

Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that housing activism in North Kensington began around 1956 when news of what eventually became the 1957 Rent Act broke. Groups such as the North Kensington Tenants Association, the Powis and Colville Residents Associations, and the St. Stephen's Gardens Tenants Association were formed in response to the proposed Act. To look briefly at the St Stephen's Tenants Association, it would seem that it had at some point been accused of being formed solely to protect the interests of white tenants, and so in an attempt to counter this, it co-opted three black people on to the committee and created a new logo showing a black hand clasping a white hand. The tenants' association went on to pass a resolution opposing both Mosley and the White Defence League's agitations in the area, as well as organising a lecture by the Jamaican clergyman Canon J.J. Hay on the benefits of 'mixed marriages'. They also spoke out against the 'colour bar' in housing, and criticised the police for standing by whilst Caribbean people were robbed. These actions went alongside complaints to the Secretary of State in respect of the police failures to protect tenants, and obtaining the services of members of the Movement for Colonial Freedom to stand guard outside of houses to ensure the safety of tenants under threat of eviction. Likewise, the Powis and Colville Residents Association in association with the Standing Conference of West Indian Organisations, put forward a resolution to encourage solidarity amongst West Indian tenants to fight landlord intimidation and inform tenants of their basic rights.³⁸⁵

385 However, this black self-organisation was strongly opposed by Nadine Peppard of the London Council of Social Service, which given her later involvement in the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI) and the criticisms made of it, is perhaps to be expected. These criticisms were that simply by coming into existence, NCCI 'dealt a severe and almost fatal blow to the embryo British civil rights movement'. Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', p. 61. See Chapter One for more on NCCI in respect of Archbishop Ramsey's chairmanship and for Hay's involvement in a 1960 Church of England 'race relations' publication entitled *Together in Britain*. DCA, PP2/49, Letter from Nadine Peppard to Donald Chesworth, 29 May 1961. St. Stephen's Tenants Association, Protest by the St. Stephen's Tenants Association to H.M. Secretary of State Against the Attitude of the Police at Notting Hill Towards the Tenants of the St. Stephen's Gardens, W.2. Area, July 1960. St. Stephen's Tenants Association, News Review, No. 4, Autumn 1960. 'Inter-Racial Tenants' Group Aims For Good Neighbours', *Kensington Post*, 11 September 1959, p. 1. 'Association Calls For End To Race Prejudices', *Kensington Post*, 18 September 1959, p. 6. 'If there's love... Mixed Marriages Are A Good Thing, Says Jamaican Clergyman', *Kensington Post*, 1 January 1960, p. 3. 'Break colour bar call by tenant's chairman', *Kensington Post*, 15 April 1960, p. 7. Stuart Douglas, 'Tenants and Police: Were We Unjust?', *Kensington Post*, 19 August 1960, p. 6. 'Tenants Accuse Police: "Inadequate protection from thugs"', *Kensington Post*, 5 August 1960, p. 1. 'Family Won't Be Thrown Out – Landlord', *Kensington Post*, 6 March 1964, p. 9. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, pp. 26–29. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 190–193.

Donald Chesworth had also been campaigning on housing issues in the area since the late-fifties and had enlisted both Trevor Huddleston and David Mason at various points in his campaigning work.³⁸⁶ Chesworth also worked with Michael de Freitas (later also known as Michael X), Lloyd Hunte, and Richard Hauser to organise weekly meetings for Caribbean people who wanted to get more involved in activism in their community. Chesworth introduced this particular group of people to members of the New Left Group, such as Stuart Hall and George Clarke, who had been coming to the area seeking to determine the reason for the white violence of 1958. Chesworth believed that 'of all the problems in Notting Hill, the worst sort of landlordism was the greatest, and that practically everything we touched brought us sooner or later to housing'.³⁸⁷ Therefore, Chesworth, the New Left Group, and de Freitas and Hunte formed a canvassing taskforce to investigate the housing issues of people suffering under the worst racketeering landlords.³⁸⁸

John Davis' argument that the name of Rachman only came light with the Profumo Affair is only partially accurate. Whilst that argument is certainly true on a national level, and whilst it is also true that many tenants did not know that Rachman was their landlord as they only had dealings with a middle-man (usually also a Rachman tenant), a draft manuscript in the Chesworth archives shows that he and other housing activists were well aware of Rachman's name. Chesworth states that the figure of Rachman was in fact brought to his attention by de Freitas in the course of the housing taskforce meetings. According to Chesworth, de Freitas came to be a part of the taskforce as he claimed that he was sick of the rackets and wanted to work with people who were genuinely trying to oppose it. Therefore, whilst Chesworth was suspicious of de Freitas' motives, he decided to work with him as someone who was effectively on the inside of Rachman's empire.³⁸⁹

386 DCA, PP2/49, Letter from J. Waring Sainsbury to Trevor Huddleston, 22 June 1959. Donald Chesworth was a key member of the Notting Hill Social Council and features strongly in the history of North Kensington of the 1960s. Chesworth was an internationalist, politician, and campaigner deeply committed to issues of social justice. See: Lorraine Screene, 'Archival Review: Donald Chesworth (1923–1991) Archives at Queen Mary, University of London', *Contemporary British History*, 24 (2010), 257–263 (pp. 257–260). See Chapter Four for the work on housing Chesworth and Mason did through the Notting Hill Social Council.

387 DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962.

388 O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, pp. 28–30. Les Back, 'At Home and Not at Home: Stuart Hall in Conversation with Les Back', *Cultural Studies*, 23 (2009), 658–687 (pp. 671–672).

389 It is likely that the reason Rachman's name was unknown by many was because the land

Chesworth and de Freitas were clearly charmed by each other. Chesworth describes de Freitas by saying 'With a flourishing beard and a ring in one ear, he looked to me like a cross between a pirate and a prophet'. In turn, de Freitas (by then Abdul Malik) described Chesworth incredibly favourably in his autobiography as 'a saint' and 'a beautiful man' and one of the only sincere whites he had met.³⁹⁰ Chesworth records that, not only did de Freitas personally bring a case against Rachman to the Rent Tribunal (he was one of the middle-man tenants), but that he also persuaded several other Rachman tenants to do the same. Whilst most tenants pulled out because of subsequent intimidation, de Freitas did not.³⁹¹ In the end, both de Freitas and Chesworth were threatened by Rachman, with Rachman calling Chesworth a 'Socialist Demagogue' to boot.³⁹² The outcomes of the remaining tribunals are not known, but many of the interviews with local residents recorded by this team show intimidation levelled against white and black tenants, extortionate rents, severe overcrowding, lack of hot water, shared toilets, and generally appalling and unsanitary housing conditions.³⁹³

At this same time, and somewhat more formally, the Notting Hill Social Council (NHSC) also tried to persuade people living in furnished accommodation to take their situation to the West London Rent Tribunal to get reductions in rent, obtain rent books, and essential repairs to the properties undertaken. This kind of tactic was undertaken for approximately eighteen months.³⁹⁴ Unfortunately though, but in keeping with the general tenor of housing activism, this action was rarely successful due to reluctance on the part of tenants to bring their cases to court, or the subsequent retraction of their statements after being

registry was not open. This meant that the owners of properties were not generally known, even by the local authorities, unless criminal proceedings could be brought. DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Ivan Weekes, June 2004. Davis, 'Rents and Race in 1960s London'.

390 Malik, *From Michael de Freitas*, pp. 83–93. Colin McGlashan, 'Hit white man back, says new militant group', *Observer*, 4 July 1968, p. 5.

391 Chesworth records that the letters purportedly from the tenants asking to pull out of the tribunal were in fact typed on the same typewriter as letters from Rachman's office. DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962.

392 DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962. Malik, *From Michael de Freitas*, pp. 83–93.

393 DCA, PP2/49, various reports in this file. See also, 'Estate Agents' Racket Exposed: "Gangsters force tenants to quit homes"', *Kensington Post*, 7 April 1961, p. 7.

394 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964.

intimidated. As a Jamaican housewife was to say,

When anybody ask what rent I pay for this room, I don't answer. What the use of taking the landlord to court? When the court changes the rent from £5 to £2 I may not be allowed to stay to enjoy it because the landlord will give me notice. Then I will be on the street.³⁹⁵

Housing activism rumbled on throughout the decade and it was rare for an edition of the *Kensington Post* to not have a feature on housing problems of one kind or another.³⁹⁶ Whether it be the establishment of the Notting Hill Housing Trust by Revd Bruce Kenrick which was singled out for the work it was doing in terms of rehousing black families, council tenants protesting rent hikes, women refusing to move after notices to quit, the exposure of illegal practises by corrupt landlords, the rise of a squatting movement, and protests against the redevelopment of properties into luxury flats and hotels, one housing report or another was generally located in each edition of the *Kensington Post*.³⁹⁷ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there were also two further major moments of housing activism undertaken: one in 1962 led by the NHSC, and another in

395 Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 24 November 1967, pp. 18, 27, quote from p. 18.

396 It was considered such a central problem by all concerned that the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council centred their first report on housing in 1963. *Report by Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council*, Cmnd. 2119. See also: *Report of the Committee on Housing in Greater London*, Cmnd. 2605 (London: HMSO, 1965), pp. 188–199. *Immigration from the Commonwealth*, Cmnd. 2739, pp. 10–11. The footnote immediately below contains just a miniscule fraction of the articles on housing found in the *Kensington Post* during 1958 to 1969. See also the following for a commentary on housing activism in Notting Hill: Jane Morton, 'New hope for Notting Hill?', *New Society*, 21 March 1968, 416–418.

397 '£6,000 Gift Launches Homes Plan. First of six is bought by Trust', *Kensington Post*, 14 February 1964, p. 1. 'Welfare Worker Reports: Immigrants becoming more adjusted', *Kensington Post*, 1 April 1966, p. 11. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 24 November 1967, pp. 18, 27. Veronica Whitty, 'Flats to Let. No colour bar and no dampness and no leaky roofs.. And the landlords are just great', *Kensington Post*, 3 January 1969, pp. 18–19. 'Tenants Plan "Final" Protest At next week's Council meeting', *Kensington Post*, 18 March 1966, p. 1. "'We Shall Defy Quit Notices". Condemned house our only home say women tenants', *Kensington Post*, 22 July 1966, p. 1. 'Squatters Move In', *Kensington Post*, 13 December 1968, p. 1. 'Bigger protest on way: Squatters to Strike Again', *Kensington Post*, 3 January 1969, p. 1. 'Bernadette Joins the Squat and Talks on Civil Rights', *Kensington Post*, 23 May 1969, pp. 16, 49. This article refers to the MP Bernadette Devlin (later McAliskey) who visited North Kensington on a few occasions in 1969. Roger Chree, 'Colville Gardens fetches £120,000 as plan for luxury hotel. Tenants in Protest at Giant "Slum" Deal', *Kensington Post*, 28 February 1969, p. 1. "'Colville tenants had no rent books"', *Kensington Post*, 28 April 1967, p. 3. This article was about the practises of the Davies Group. Later that year, the owner of the Group, Bowen Davies, shot himself and his family and left a note stating that the burden on his conscience of the suffering he had caused people was too much for him to take. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 38. Chris Holmes states that Kenrick saw the NHHT not only as putting a roof over people's heads, but also as a project in 'racial integration' and also in helping people retrain and dramatically change their lives by giving them a secure and safe place to live and by utilising local training centres. Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*, pp. 15–16.

1967 led by the Notting Hill Summer Project but involving the NHSC. Both shall be discussed in Chapter Four.

It is probable that the atrocious housing conditions of North Kensington offered a clear and tangible way for people to *unite* in community action. It will have been as evident to the residents of 1966 London as it is to those of 2016, that access to affordable, safe and secure housing is *the* most important issue facing people. This is especially so for people on low incomes who are necessarily at the mercy of profiteering landlords in the face of scarce social and council housing resources. Furthermore, as a tangible, practical, vital, and visual aspect of life around which to gather, housing offers a critical and *physical* site of resistance for local people. Housing and the politics of 'race' are entwined and enmeshed because of their relationship with everyday life. Therefore, when housing, as a vital aspect of everyday life, is wedded to wider issues of injustice and racism as was the case in Notting Hill, it is clear to see how, as Jim House and Andrew Thompson suggest, housing emerges as one of the key aspects of the changes brought to London through post-war migration from the New Commonwealth.³⁹⁸

'Race Relations' and Black Activism

As is to be expected, many organisations with an explicit 'race relations' mandate were set up in the wake of the 1958 white violence. These groups followed the same patterns of emphases that we have seen in Chapter One in respect of Christian engagement in this area: a white-led, integrationist 'harmony' focus in the early part of the decade, moving into a more hard-line and anti-racist approach by the end of the decade. From the beginning of the period surveyed, there were clearly 'race relations' organisations and initiatives which were white-led and those which were black-led.³⁹⁹ As such, and also because of the differences in how they were reported on, not to mention the divergence of emphasis of each type of group by the mid-sixties, black- and white-led groups will be treated separately.

Probably the most immediate white-led response was the formation of the Stars

³⁹⁸ House and Thompson, 'Decolonisation, space and power', p. 241. For more information on discrimination in housing during the sixties see: Daniel, *Racial Discrimination in England*, pp. 151–196.

³⁹⁹ Black-led organisations had existed in Britain for a long time in the form of Pan-African movements. See, for instance, Adi, *West Africans in Britain*.

Campaign for Interracial Friendship (SCIF), which included Musicians Union members such as Johnny Dankworth, Tommy Steele, and Frankie Vaughan. Whilst the organisers of SCIF were not themselves based in North Kensington, the organisation did leaflet drop in the area towards the end of the violence, and consequentially set up a 'Harmony Club' for teenagers which initially met regularly in the North Kensington Community Centre in Dalgarno Way, W10. Several other ventures also operated from the North Kensington Community Centre, one of which was a weekly 'Overseas Club' with the stated aim of producing 'harmony'. Whilst the Overseas Club was solely for 'coloured residents' and included Caribbean entertainers, music, and drama, the desired outcome was that the Caribbean users would eventually integrate into the life of the Community Centre more generally. The Overseas club was started in November 1958 and had around 20 regular members by December of that year.⁴⁰⁰

Another immediate venture after the riots was the Racial Integration Co-ordinating Committee. This was a Council-run project, although given the impetus by Albert Bullock, the organiser of the North Kensington Community Association which was based in the Community Centre mentioned above. It included the Mayor of Kensington, Revd Elliott of the Notting Hill Methodist Church, a member of the Council of Christians and Jews, and other local social, youth, and educational workers.⁴⁰¹ Additionally, it also had 'representatives of various countries' on the Committee, such as Amy Garvey (Jamaica), B.B. Khan (Pakistan), F.A. Fisher (West Africa), and others. There was also a Conference on 'Inter-Racial Unity in West London' sponsored by the North Kensington Co-op Party and the local branch of the Movement for Colonial Freedom; a Christmas party for 300 black and white kids at a local school including a black Father Christmas and a steel band playing Jingle Bells; and a Caribbean Christmas party put on by the British Caribbean Association at the Kensington

400 "'Show Biz" Stars to Fight Race Bias', *Kensington Post*, 3 October 1958, p. 1. See also: Rick Blackman, 'Rock and Roll against racism', *Socialist Review*, 409 (2016), <<http://socialistreview.org.uk/409/rock-and-roll-against-racism>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. 'Voluntary Workers' Target is Harmony. Goodwill spirit in race relations. Community centre as focal point', *Kensington Post*, 12 December 1958, p. 1. 'Harmony Club on Monday', *Kensington Post*, 16 January 1959, p. 1. "'House Full" At Harmony Club's First Session', *Kensington Post*, 23 January 1959, p. 1. "'Overseas" Section for North Ken. Centre', *Kensington Post*, 7 November 1958, p. 6.

401 Revd Elliott was the minister before the Team Ministry arrived at the Lancaster Road Church in 1960.

Town Hall. All of which, it is clear, were integrationist and 'harmony' oriented ventures.⁴⁰²

Most of these ventures ended after a few weeks, so it is unsurprising that the *Kensington Post* was to run an article on the one-year anniversary of the white violence stating that so little had been done that the mass violence could resurface at any time. Indeed, as has been previously stated, physical violence against black people did continue regularly throughout the early part of the decade (not to mention the tragic murder of Kelso Cochrane in May 1959), with entrenched, verbally and structurally articulated racism continuing into the seventies and beyond. Therefore, despite the flurry of 'race relations' activity, the Borough's West Indian Social Worker, Yolande Baum-Achong, stated in 1959 that the problems brought to her remained much the same as the previous year. Other black activists such as Raf de Leon of the Coloured People's Accommodation Bureau called North Kensington a 'place of fear'; and Frances Ezzreco of the Coloured People's Progressive Association said there was no peace, and referenced nightly attacks on black people. There had then, been a lot of talk, a few meetings, but no real action or solution to the the neighbourhood's racialised problems.⁴⁰³

Pansy Jeffrey replaced Yolande Baum-Achong as the Borough's West Indian Social Worker in September 1959.⁴⁰⁴ Pansy Jeffrey worked tirelessly in North Kensington from her base in the Citizens' Advice Bureau throughout this decade and beyond, and we shall learn more of her in the following chapter due to her

402 The British Caribbean Association had some North Kensington members such as Yolande Baum-Achong, Robert Skyers (engineer), Roy Lando (cosmetics manufacturer and hairdresser), and Josephine Douglas, amongst others. 'Caribbean Night', *Kensington Post*, 16 December 1960, p. 6. 'Kensington's part in new Caribbean Association', *Kensington Post*, 13 March 1959, p. 5. 'Integration Committee Meets', *Kensington Post*, 3 October 1958, p. 1. 'Colour crisis: battles only of words. Committees seek solution', *Kensington Post*, 12 September 1958, p. 1. 'Integration Group Get Cracking', *Kensington Post*, 31 October 1958, p. 1. "'If We Fail To Combat Racialism..'" Enemies Will Gloat, M.P. Warns "Unity" Conference', *Kensington Post*, 24 July 1959, p. 3. 'This "Harmony" Party Rang True', *Kensington Post*, 2 January 1959, p. 3.

403 Although a Quaker work-camp venture where young people went around redecorating and doing repairs on people's houses was later singled out for praise. 'Riots Anniversary Probe: What Harmony Has Been Achieved?', *Kensington Post*, 28 August 1959, p. 1. Editorial, 'Where There's Goodwill There's Hope', *Kensington Post*, 4 September 1959, p. 4.

404 'West Indian' in that the worker was from the 'West Indies' and hired to deal with the problems of other Caribbean people. RBKC, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1959, Vol. LIX, Report of the General Purposes Committee, 8 December 1959, pp. 413–414.

involvement with the Notting Hill Social Council.⁴⁰⁵ However, here one should briefly give voice to Jeffrey's continued concerns over housing and young people. In common with many of the black activists we have met throughout this study, Pansy Jeffrey also placed 'the situation' in Notting Hill in a global context, and emphasised the white aggression of 'the situation' by equating white demonstrations against the presence of two black students at a university in Georgia with that of the practises of racist white landladies in Britain. Jeffrey also persistently raised her concerns over discrimination against young black people and as early as 1961, suggested that 'North Kensington might have a teenage problem – involving the eights to eighteens – in the future'.⁴⁰⁶ Further to this, in 1964 and again in 1967, she was reported as noting that Caribbean children were not advancing to grammar or technical schools which she warned would lead to a generation of second-class unskilled citizens.⁴⁰⁷

Before turning to black-led groups, any comment on 'race' and community action in Notting Hill would be incomplete were it to fail to mention the Notting Hill Carnival. Whilst it is clear that Claudia Jones organised the first specifically *Caribbean* carnival in London in 1959 as a response to the white violence of 1958, the Notting Hill Carnival itself has a separate origin predominately in the work of a white community worker, Rhaune Laslett, and the London Free School (LFS). Laslett was an integrationist and she saw the carnival as a way of uniting the various groups in Notting Hill. As such, she situated the carnival in the context of Notting Hill history which meant that the first carnival in September 1966 featured a tableaux of various moments in the history of

405 Jeffrey later recalled that she was there simply to deal with black people so that the other white employees of CAB did not have to. Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality', p. 165.

406 'West Indians – Mrs J. reports', *Kensington Post*, 13 January 1961, p. 1.

407 Editorial, 'Welfare and the West Indian', *Kensington Post*, 20 January 1961, p. 4. 'Warning of "Little Harlems" in W.11. Urgent Action Is Needed Says Council's Welfare Worker', *Kensington Post*, 17 January 1964, p. 1. 'Community Worker Warns of "Serious" Problem in N. Kens.', *Kensington Post*, 4 August 1967, p. 24. Here Jeffrey is voicing the concerns of what would become the Black Parents Movement and the rise of supplementary schools. For more information on black educational movements, see: Kevin Myers and Ian Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education: margins, theories and methods', *History of Education*, 40 (2011), 501–520. Coard, *How the West Indian Child is Made Educationally Subnormal*. Warmington, *Black British Intellectuals and Education*, pp. 31–71. Hazel V. Carby, 'Schooling in Babylon', in *The Empire Strikes Back*, by Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, pp. 183–211. Andrews, *Resisting Racism*. Sally Tomlinson, 'The "Black Education" Movement', in *Race and Gender: Equal Opportunities Policies in Education*, ed. by Madeleine Arnot (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985, repr. 1988), pp. 65–77. Sally Tomlinson, *Race and education: policy and politics in Britain* (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Open University Press, 2008).

Kensington.⁴⁰⁸

Whilst Laslett and the LFS were the driving force behind the venture in the first couple of years, this is not to suggest that there was no black involvement from the outset.⁴⁰⁹ In fact, when the promised grant from the Borough was withdrawn by the Mayor, it was speculated that this was due to the involvement of Michael X (aka de Freitas) in the organisation of the carnival. As an important note of contrast with the *Kensington Post's* lack of support for the IRC as we shall see below, the editorial line in the *Post* was highly critical of the Borough's lack of support for Carnival. It is clear that its support of Laslett's Carnival *vis-à-vis* Frank Bailey's IRC is because of the integrationist line the former promoted.⁴¹⁰ What this shows is that, whilst ostensibly a cultural event, carnival has always had a political element.⁴¹¹ From the earlier self-conscious multi-racial and integrationist aspects of the event, to the relationship between the activities of the carnival organisers, artists, and musicians to their other activist work around housing and play-space, etc., in the area: carnival was, and is, much more than a neutral site of play.

It is acknowledged that the 1958 violence created a sense of solidarity and defiance amongst black people.⁴¹² Despite this, it is much harder to piece together the actions and activities of black-led groups owing to the significantly less space and detail accorded to them on the part of the local press. In her

408 There had been an annual festival in the area up until 1870. 'Planned for the autumn... A Notting Hill Festival', *Kensington Post*, 10 June 1966, p. 22. Everton A. Pryce, 'The Notting Hill Gate Carnival — Black Politics, Resistance, and Leadership, 1976-1978', *Caribbean Quarterly*, 31 (1985), 35–52 (p. 35). Abner Cohen, *Masquerade Politics: Explorations in the Structure of Urban Cultural Movements* (Oxford: Berg, 1993), pp. 10–20. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 274–277. Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*, p. 47. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004. Sivanandan, 'From Resistance to Rebellion', pp. 10–11.

409 From 1967, it was Laslett and the Notting Hill Neighbourhood Service as the LFS collapsed. By the end of the decade, Carnival had become a predominately black-led affair. 'Caribbean Touch to Notting Hill's Carnival Procession', *Kensington Post*, 22 September 1967, pp. 18–19. Pryce, 'The Notting Hill Gate Carnival'. Cohen, *Masquerade Politics*. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, pp. 274–277.

410 At this time, Michael X (de Freitas) was under surveillance by Special Branch due to his suspected involvement with the Black Muslims. Despite the late withdrawal of promised funds, local market traders and residents raised the necessary £100 for the festival to go ahead. 'Mayor Withdraws Support for Fair: No Civic Patronage for Free School', *Kensington Post*, 5 August 1966, p. 1. 'Festival Week at Notting Hill', *Kensington Post*, 16 September 1966, p. 1. Editorial, 'Bogies in the Carnival?', *Kensington Post*, 30 September 1966, p. 6.

411 Cohen, *Masquerade Politics*, p. 152.

412 Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, p. 185. Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality', p. 107.

detailed study of community action in Notting Hill based on her involvement with it, Jan O'Malley stated that she was 'never aware of local black groups pursuing a political strategy which related to the needs of the working class in the area, black or white, in a coherent way'. She went on to say that even when well-organised defence groups won their cases, such as that of the Mangrove 9, 'there was no attempt to shift from the defensive to the offensive and expand a political strategy on a wider front'.⁴¹³ However, as the Phillips brothers say, this is most likely due to a difference in organising and meetings style, as many political meetings were held in black people's homes in order to deflect external attention away from the discussions. In support of this, a document produced by the Mangrove Community Association on the history of black people in North Kensington states that the Rio, and later the Mangrove, served both as restaurants and as community centres and were therefore 'at the forefront of local black politics and culture'. These meeting spaces served as locations wherein black people could get advice on welfare, housing, and health, as well as providing a free twenty-four hour law service. All of which were services funded by the black community itself.⁴¹⁴ So it is less that black people were not engaging with politics, and more that they did so in a way which was different to the expectations of white activists. And moreover, what activities were undertaken were not reported on to the same degree as white-led activism.

For instance, whilst one can learn all about the early white-led 'inter-racial' activities organised at the North Kensington Community Centre, one can only learn that black people elected a committee of ten unnamed people to represent their interests to the mayor in the days immediately after the violence.⁴¹⁵

Likewise, we only learn that several unnamed African and West Indian organisations held an emergency meeting after the murder of Kelso Cochrane and wrote a letter to the Prime Minister stating that: 'Coloured citizens of the United Kingdom and possibly throughout the Commonwealth have lost confidence in the ability of the law-enforcing agencies to protect them'. As such, they called for an 'anti-racial law to be passed'.⁴¹⁶ Who these people were and

413 O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 7.

414 KCSC, Mangrove Community Association, *A History of Black People in North Kensington*, n.d. c. 1982. Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, p. 220.

415 'Colour crisis: battles only of words. Committees seek solution', *Kensington Post*, 12 September 1958, p. 1.

416 "Coloured Folk Have Lost Confidence", *Kensington Post*, 22 May 1959, p. 1.

any further activities, statements, and actions they might have undertaken are impossible to know on the basis of local newspaper reports.⁴¹⁷

There are scant references to other black-led North Kensington groups in the early part of the decade. For instance, we can learn that Amy Garvey ran the Afro-Asian Club in North Kensington, and founded the short-lived Association for the Advancement of Coloured People. Likewise, the Coloured People's Progressive Association (CPPA), which featured Michael de Freitas as vice-president, organised a delegation to visit George Rogers (MP) at the House of Commons to speak on the socio-economic and political issues facing black people in North Kensington. The CPPA also organised a march down Downing Street protesting against racism and the 'colour bar'.⁴¹⁸ However, given the levels of detail given on other forms of community activism and 'race relations' projects, it is clear that black-led organisations were largely ignored by the *Post*.

A good comparison is the difference in attention given to reporting on black-led, *multi-racial* social centres. There was passing reference to the West Indian Standing Conference launching an appeal to raise £50,000 to start an Anglo-Caribbean Social Centre to show the contribution Caribbean people made, and were making, to the life of the country.⁴¹⁹ In contrast, an Indian film and TV producer called Rajkumar Siddhartha publicly floated the idea of a Commonwealth Centre to be based in the Borough, which would serve as a multi-racial social centre or meeting place for the 'ordinary people' of the Commonwealth who lived and worked in Kensington and Chelsea. The idea received a lot of positive attention from the *Post* and lots of letters of praise and support were published. The letters came particularly from Indian and Pakistani people who saw in it inspiration to solve disputes in the sub-continent, alongside

417 This is not to say that records of these activities do not exist (although Rosalind Wild's research suggests that they mostly do not), but rather that they were not considered important enough to report on in any detail until the advent of more militant Black Power groups. Wild, "Black was the colour of our fight.", p. 13.

418 The protestors had posters which carried slogans like 'Racial discrimination should be illegal' and 'There is only one race, the human race'. 'Colour protest in Whitehall', *Kensington Post*, 5 June 1959, p. 1. 'Delegation Goes to See Mr Rogers', *Kensington Post*, 12 June 1959, p. 1. 'Now Sir Patrick Says It: Warning on Race Riots', *Kensington Post*, 1 May 1959, p. 1. Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality', p. 109.

419 'Clubs for all races', *Kensington Post*, 21 April 1961, p. 4. 'Appeal for West Indian social centre', *Kensington Post*, 22 June 1962, p. 5. Later in the decade, we also learn that Sammy Davis Jr. offered \$5,000 for the funding of a West Indian cultural centre in Kensington. 'Sammy makes a Golden Offer', *Kensington Post*, 12 July 1968, p. 1.

other letters of praise from liberal whites.⁴²⁰ As with many proposed ventures, it does not seem that it ever went ahead, but the support it received is somewhat remarkable in terms of levels of enthusiasm.

Whilst it is clear from the above that black people were organising in Notting Hill in the first part of the decade, it is probably also true to say that there was less self-organisation than in the second half due to the fact that black people were too busy trying to survive.⁴²¹ Corresponding with the visits of prominent black Americans from the middle of the decade such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, John Lewis, and Stokely Carmichael, we find the establishment of more militant (and hence more audible) black-led organisations. These organisations eventually began publishing their own papers and journals to reach readers and speak truths not covered by local and national presses.⁴²² Perhaps because of an increase in the amount of organisation, but in all probability more likely due to the change of tenor of black voices by the middle of the decade, we find the *Kensington Post* running a leader in 1965 acknowledging the continued racism *and* stating that 'immigrants' were now starting to speak up: 'we are hearing arguments and ideas from the people who

420 'Commonwealth Centre Idea by an Indian Film Producer', *Kensington Post*, 29 October 1965, p. 6. AJ Page, 'Kensington Centre for World Citizens?', *Kensington Post*, 5 November 1965, p. 11. Muhammad Waris, 'More support for "World Centre" idea', *Kensington Post*, 12 November 1965, p. 5. Ali Hussein, 'This Would Answer Our Prayers', *Kensington Post*, 12 November 1965, p. 5. Editorial, 'A Commonwealth Centre? It can be done', *Kensington Post*, 26 November 1965, p. 6. R Gandhi, '"The Need of the Day"', *Kensington Post*, 26 November 1965, p. 11. Nazarali Shah, '"The Aga Khan would help"', *Kensington Post*, 26 November 1965, p. 11. Roy Perkins, 'Priority for racial harmony', *Kensington Post*, 3 December 1965, p. 7. Asghar Ali, MD Rouf, Jehangir Khan, and SA Mirza, 'World Centre Welcomed', *Kensington Post*, 3 December 1965, p. 7. Yadunandan Prasad, 'World Centre: Encouragement from India', *Kensington Post*, 10 December 1965, p. 8. AP Barratt, 'Racial Teach-In Mooted', *Kensington Post*, 14 January 1966, p. 5.

421 Wild, '"Black was the colour of our fight."', pp. 33–35.

422 Whilst it was not a militant organisation, MLK's visit prompted the formation of CARD. RAAS was formed by Michael X (de Freitas) after Malcolm X's visit. John Lewis was chairman of SNCC and was invited to Britain by CARD. He suggested setting up a British chapter of SNCC at a Kensington meeting. Stokely Carmichael's visit was critical in many ways, not just for the awakening of the Black Panther Movement in the UK. In respect of self-published papers and journals, looking only at those local to Notting Hill, we find that the Eagles, a North Kensington Black Power group, published a widely read newspaper. There was also a journal called *The Immigrant* edited by Iqbal Hussain, and a paper called *The Hustler* was published from the basement of Toc H. Heineman, Jr, *The Politics of the Powerless*. Wild, '"Black was the colour of our fight."', p. 82. Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality', pp. 120–123. 'Gathering friends for the cause. Students come to Kensington', *Kensington Post*, 29 April 1966, p. 6. Bunce and Field, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain'. Waters, 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness', p. 14. Roger Chree, 'Study in black and white', *Kensington Post*, 10 January 1969, p. 11. Roger Chree, 'The role of the immigrant in our society', *Kensington Post*, 15 November 1968, p. 21.

know most about the problem: the coloured immigrants themselves. And, predictably, the revolution is based in the area that has come to stand for racial hatred: Notting Hill'.⁴²³ As we have seen above, 1965 certainly did not mark the beginning of black anti-racist speech: rather, black voices were then beginning to be heard by liberal whites because frustration had pushed them towards more militant rhetoric.

There have been several fairly recent studies of black British radicalism and black political self-organisation in the later part of the sixties and into the seventies.⁴²⁴ Rather than rehash these excellent studies, below we shall briefly look at how the *Kensington Post* engaged with the more persistent black voices of the later part of the sixties. As a consequence of the *Kensington Post*'s sudden ability to hear black voices, they also announced their intentions to hold a 'race forum'. This forum eventually led to the establishment of the IRC of which we shall learn more about below. For now it shall suffice to say that the *Post*'s editorial line was, at best, one of liberal integrationism at this time.

In 1967, the prominent *Observer* journalist Colin McGlashan wrote to the *Kensington Post* criticising the newspaper for failing to understand the situation of black people in North Kensington. One of his suggestions for rectifying this was for the *Post* to employ a black reporter.⁴²⁵ Possibly as a response to this,

423 Rosalind Wild dates black rejection of liberalism to 1965 due to disappointment over the ineffectual Race Relations Act. It was also the year of the White Paper on immigration which was to anger many activists. Wild, "Black was the colour of our fight.", pp. 70–71. Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', pp. 38–43. Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality', p. 163. Colin McGlashan, 'White Paper gives fuel to the militants', *Observer*, 8 August 1965, p. 4. 'Race Problems Mount. Immigrants plan "defence groups"', *Kensington Post*, 3 September 1965, p. 1. *Immigration from the Commonwealth*, Cmnd. 2739.

424 Waters, 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness'. Angelo, 'The Black Panthers in London'. Bunce and Field, *Darcus Howe*. Bunce and Field, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain'. Wild, "Black was the colour of our fight.". Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality'. W. Chris Johnson, 'Guerrilla Ganja Gun Girls: Policing Black Revolutionaries from Notting Hill to Laventille', *Gender & History*, 26 (2014), 661–687. Stephen Tuck's book is more wide-ranging, but is an important read: *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, see especially pp. 165–204.

425 Colin McGlashan, 'Patronising goodwill not wanted', *Kensington Post*, 15 September 1967, p. 12. Colin McGlashan wrote widely on 'race' and 'race relations' in Britain from 1965 for *The Observer*. See, for instance: Colin McGlashan, 'Integrating Britain's anti-racists', *Observer*, 24 January 1965, p. 12. Colin McGlashan, 'Hit white man back, says new militant group', *Observer*, 4 July 1965, p. 5. Colin McGlashan, 'Jenkins going into the attack against racial prejudice', *Observer*, 20 February 1966, p. 13. Colin McGlashan, 'Civil rights in W.10', *Observer*, 25 June 1967, p. 13. Stokely Carmichael, 'Mainspring of Black Power: Colin McGlashan talks to Stokely Carmichael', *Observer*, 23 July 1967, p. 17. Colin McGlashan, 'Growing Up With Pinky: Britain's black teenagers talk to Colin McGlashan', *Observer*, 10 September 1967, p. 17. Colin McGlashan, 'The light and the dark', *Observer*, 16 August

the *Kensington Post* did in fact run a series of hard-hitting articles by a black reporter called Patricia Philo a couple of months later. Each of Philo's articles focused on a now familiar area: housing, employment, and the social aspects of 'race relations', or perhaps more specifically, social segregation. Given the liberal editorial line of the paper, Philo's articles were quite exceptional as she held no punches when talking of the racism experienced by black people across these three areas. Yet, whilst repeatedly disrupting the myth of tolerance by continually underscoring how white English people refused to admit they were prejudiced despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, she did also make note of those few white activists and white-led organisations which were an exception to the rule.⁴²⁶

A few months later, after a radicalising incident involving the formerly liberal 'race relations' body the paper had helped to set up (the IRC), the *Kensington Post* ran a series of articles on Black Power which varied in tone from sensationalism to scaremongering to criticisms and refutations. The articles underscored the threat of violence which Black Power allegedly posed, the testosterone laden invective of the movement's leaders, the revolutionary fervour for the end of capitalist exploitation, the willingness to fight to end the violence of white domination, and the alleged lack of utility of the ideology for Britain. Alongside this was prose suggesting the vanity of the movement's leaders: their uncertain yet careful stylistic representation in speech and body. Accompanied and overshadowed by this was buried the simple demands of the Black Power movement: better educational opportunities for young people, the ending of discrimination in housing and employment, and the desire for equality which, once achieved, would render calls for integration meaningless.⁴²⁷

The *Kensington Post*'s liberalism clearly did not reflect the politics of many activists, black and radical white, in Notting Hill by the end of the decade. As we

1970, p. 6.

426 These were the Notting Hill Methodist Church, Rhaune Laslett of the Notting Hill Neighbourhood Service, George Clarke of the Community Workshop, and the Notting Hill Housing Trust. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 24 November 1967, p. 18, 27. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 1 December 1967, p. 18, 31, quote from p. 31. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 8 December 1967, p. 18, 43.

427 Jimoh Gbadamoshi, 'Black Power', *Kensington Post*, 16 February 1968, p. 9. Peter Hodgson, "Right is Might, Might is White – And White Means Power", *Kensington Post*, 1 March 1968, pp. 20–21.

will see in the following chapter, as a part of the Notting Hill Summer Project, George Clarke (a radical white activist) organised a teach-in on 'race relations' which Roy Sawh and other local Black Power activists participated in. The teach-in was subsequently criticised strongly in a *Kensington Post* editorial for allegedly 'bitter attacks on white liberals'.⁴²⁸ The *Post* was then a local paper but not a *community* paper and was therefore tied to the perspective of the establishment.⁴²⁹ And this perspective, was one of a liberal, integrationist myth of tolerance approach which rejected outright any suggestion of conflict, alongside rejecting contestations, and criticisms, of white domination.

Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council

As was noted above, the origins of the IRC are in a 'race forum' sponsored by the *Kensington Post* in September 1965. On the same page as a leader noting rising racial tension and the alleged emergence of the voices of black protest, the paper noted that it had been asked to sponsor a 'race forum'.⁴³⁰ This forum had the stated aim of discussing 'the setting up of [a] *strictly non-political* committee to promote a sense of community among people of various nationalities who live and work in the Royal Borough'.⁴³¹ The emphasis on the apolitical nature of the group marks it in two ways: as an organisation belonging to the first half of the sixties, and secondly as one which was white-led. Indeed, the newspaper cites Rosalind Schama of the Chelsea Liberal Association and Jonathan Rosenhead, a prospective Labour Party candidate, as the principal organisers who hoped to have 'the active participation of representatives of immigrant groups'.⁴³²

As a consequence of the 'race forum', Anne Evans, a local Justice of the Peace and founder member of the IRC, wrote an article about four local

428 'Comment', *Kensington Post*, 1 September 1967, p. 6.

429 In contrast, John Davis shows the *South London Press* (SLP) to have been strongly critical of establishment points of view. For instance, the SLP asserted that the racist element of the 1958 white violence was downplayed by other newspapers 'in order "to show Americans and South Africans that we are not race conscious in this country"'. Davis, 'Containing Racism?', p. 131.

430 Alleged emergence in that, as we have seen above, black people had been articulating their point of view for many years prior. 'Race Problems Mount. Immigrants plan "defence groups"', *Kensington Post*, 3 September 1965, p. 1.

431 'We will sponsor a "race forum"', *Kensington Post*, 3 September 1965, p. 1, *emphasis mine*.

432 Nadine Peppard, by then of NCCI, was also present. 'We will sponsor a "race forum"', *Kensington Post*, 3 September 1965, p. 1. 'Race Forum Ends on Note of Wary Optimism', *Kensington Post*, 10 September 1965, p. 1.

'Commonwealth citizens' as a way to highlight the common ground between the black 'them' and the (presumed white) audience. The portraits Evans put forth can be understood as a way of promoting both the 'ideal immigrant' and of promoting the myth of tolerance that the white leaders of the IRC wished to give voice and space to. As such, we find that each 'Commonwealth citizen' was gainfully employed, hard-working, an advocate of integration, in awe of Britain's alleged 'liberal traditions of freedom and justice', had never experienced racism in the UK, and had 'a healthy cynicism towards some of the laments of people with larger-than-life chips on their shoulder'.⁴³³ The common ground was then, an assent to a white, liberal, integrationist viewpoint, and demonstrated the accuracy of black activists' accusations that integration meant a relinquishing of black selfhood to the white social body.

The IRC eventually launched in January 1966, with the involvement of the Mayor of Kensington, the former Conservative MP William Compton Carr, the barrister Anthony Gifford (Lord), Anne Evans, and other white liberals.⁴³⁴ At that point, there were also two black people on the Committee: Pansy Jeffrey and Ivan Weekes who was a NHMC member and who was co-opted as Treasurer of the IRC. Despite now tipping over into the latter part of the decade, the IRC's stated aims were still decidedly unradical and typical of white-dominated 'race relations' bodies: they were committed to 'the spreading of Liberal ideas on race relations, educating the community to overcome ignorance and delving into specific injustices'.⁴³⁵ By August 1967, a third black person – Frank Bailey – was on board as chairman, and the IRC now sought to move their offices from the remote South Kensington into the Notting Hill area.⁴³⁶ In order to fund this

433 The article was about four different people: Rashid Karapiet from Delhi, Martin Zephyr from Guyana, Tara Chandra from Guyana, and the Wallace family from Jamaica. Anne Evans, J.P., 'Commonwealth profiles', *Kensington Post*, 17 September 1965, p. 6.

434 'Council may back inter-racial group', *Kensington Post*, 14 October 1966, p. 24.

435 'Inter-racial group starts work in Kensington and Chelsea. Support of Borough's leaders is asked', *Kensington Post*, 21 January 1966, p. 1. See Chapter Four for more on Pansy Jeffrey and her involvement with the Notting Hill Social Council and Chapter Two for more on Ivan Weekes as a member of the Notting Hill Methodist Church.

436 Earlier in his life, Frank Bailey was also one of the first black firefighters in Britain and a Fire Brigades Union branch rep. By the late 1960s, he was also involved with the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants and a member of the Greater London Conciliation Committee. 'Their aim is better inter-race relations', *Kensington Post*, 18 August 1967, p. 3. 'Indian "Treated Like Criminal"', *The Times*, 20 December 1967, p. 3. Peter Calvocoressi, Frank Bailey, *et. al.*, 'Race relations', *The Times*, 12 March 1968, p. 1. Michael Nicholas, 'Frank Bailey obituary', *Guardian*, 26 January 2016, <<http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jan/26/frank-bailey-obituary>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. 'Brigade pays tribute to London's first post-war black firefighter ahead of ceremonial funeral', London Fire

move and a part-time member of staff, the IRC had received £1,500 from Kensington and Chelsea Borough Council and hoped to obtain further funds from NCCI which, by 1968 they had obtained.⁴³⁷

However, February 1968 was witness to a sea change.⁴³⁸ At an inaugural public meeting of the IRC which was chaired by the Mayor of Kensington, and which saw approximately one hundred and fifty people present, Frank Bailey broke from the script when it came time for him to speak. Instead of simply outlining the aims of the IRC as he was supposed to do, he chose to voice strong criticisms of the police and local magistrates which he accused of baiting and persecuting black people.⁴³⁹ Bailey also outlined the various ways in which black people had experienced racism since they first arrived in Britain: he shamed local employers for their discriminatory employment practises, talked of police harassment of young black people, spoke of the exclusion of black youth from local youth clubs, and of the appalling housing conditions black people faced in the Borough.⁴⁴⁰ Alongside Bailey's use of the words 'colour' and 'black', this script-breaking indictment of institutional racism caused the Mayor to threaten to leave.⁴⁴¹ In a later patronising and scornful editorial, the *Kensington*

Brigade, 12 January 2016, <http://www.london-fire.gov.uk/news/LatestNewsReleases_Ceremonialfuneralforfirstblackfirefighter.asp> [accessed 15 September 2016].

- 437 The IRC was considered an official liaison body by NCCI from its inception in 1966. National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, *The First Six Months*, p. 16. 'Their aim is better inter-race relations', *Kensington Post*, 18 August 1967, p. 3. 'A Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, July 1968. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings from January 1967 to December 1967, Vol. 3, Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council, 12 December 1967, p. 732. 'Inter-Racial Council grant', *Kensington Post*, 18 August 1967, p. 19.
- 438 Remembering that from towards the end of 1967 there were various challenges to the prevailing liberal viewpoint in Notting Hill: the Summer Project's 'race relations' teach-in, Colin McGlashan's critique, and Patricia Philo's articles.
- 439 Strong criticisms of the police were to continue throughout the IRC's lifespan. See: 'Arrest – The Police and You', *Spectre*, July 1968. 'The Police and the Public', *Spectre*, August 1968. 'The Case of Jal Patel', *Spectre*, January 1969. 'Comment', *Spectre*, March 1969. See also: John A. Blunt, 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, May 1969. 'Racial Council plan "police methods" probe', *Kensington Post*, 2 August 1968, p. 1. 'Police reply to article's charge of "victimisation". Race Hate Claim is "Tripe"', *Kensington Post*, 21 March 1969, p. 1.
- 440 The problems facing black youths were a perennial concern of Bailey and Cummings. Peter Hodgson, 'Mayor criticised and abused: Black Power Men Disrupt "Race" Meeting', *Kensington Post*, 2 February 1968, pp. 1, 20. "'Problems of coloured youth not understood"', *Kensington Post*, 29 March 1968, p. 27. 'Mercury Magazine: Round Up', *Kensington Post*, 9 August 1968, p. 13. Roger Chree, 'James Cummings: Integration at work', *Kensington Post*, 4 April 1969, pp. 14, 31. 'Fixture deplorable, Sir Learie says', *The Times*, 30 January 1968, p. 2. 'Changing Patterns', *Spectre*, October and November 1968. 'Forum', *Spectre*, June 1969. John A. Blunt, 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, June 1969.
- 441 The Mayor objected to the use of such words and claimed that 'I'm colour blind. There's no point in using these words. I said in my opening remarks that we should keep them out.' One wonders how precisely one can have a discussion on 'race relations' without referring

Post blamed Bailey for the dissension in the room and informed him that 'nothing will be achieved by insulting the people whose help you have sought'.⁴⁴²

Despite Bailey's strong criticisms, and probably because he ended on an integrationist note, both Bailey and James Cummings, the IRC's Liaison Officer, found themselves heckled by Black Power supporters present in the audience. Other than some sarcastic heckles – Bailey and Cummings were variously called 'white man's lackey', 'uncle Tom', and 'white man's boy' – much of what was said by the Black Power activists was not reported on. However, we are told that Ajoy Ghose informed the audience that 'Integration means giving up our rights and cultures for the brutal western society. If we follow that, they will rule us again'.⁴⁴³ Noting the general omission of the interjections by Black Power supporters on the part of the *Kensington Post*'s reporter, a letter from Roy Sawh in the following week stated that the heckles were in response to the Mayor's opposition to the usage of the word black ('don't you think we have a right to say what we should be called?'), and an explanation of black people's opposition to integration ('We do not believe the white man any more. We are not racist, just realists').⁴⁴⁴

At this juncture, there was clearly a battle over the control and direction of the IRC. Whatever criticisms Sawh, Ghose, and the others had levelled at Bailey and Cummings in the public meeting, and whatever their conduct had been in the past, from this moment on Bailey and Cummings clearly were *not* 'uncle Toms'. At a follow-up private meeting organised at a local pub by Mrs Lee Ackbar and attended by several members of the IRC including Revd David Mason as well as Black Power supporters, attempts were made to heal the rift between the two groups. This must have worked to some degree as by March 1968, we learn that Roy Sawh was to run as a Black Power candidate in the

to racialised differences. Peter Hodgson, 'Mayor criticised and abused: Black Power Men Disrupt "Race" Meeting', *Kensington Post*, 2 February 1968, pp. 1, 20.

442 Editorial, 'Disintegration', *Kensington Post*, 9 February 1968, p. 6.

443 Peter Hodgson, 'Mayor criticised and abused: Black Power Men Disrupt "Race" Meeting', *Kensington Post*, 2 February 1968, pp. 1, 20.

444 Roy Sawh, 'Don't you expect us to heckle?', *Kensington Post*, 9 February 1968, p. 3. That same letter page saw a lengthy letter from Cllr Bruce Douglas-Mann on the meeting which perfectly articulated the myth of tolerance: Britain allegedly lacked racism, unlike the USA or South Africa, and 'despite the fact that white Englishmen have for 400 years been enslaving black people, or exploiting them economically' most white people had not benefited from this. Moreover, what black people perceived as racial discrimination was in fact black people's fault as the English could not understand their alien ways. Bruce Douglas-Mann, 'Black Power', *Kensington Post*, 9 February 1968, p. 3.

upcoming by-election, that Frank Bailey was his agent, and that Bailey had chaired a public meeting on Black Power in Kensington Town Hall.⁴⁴⁵ Unfortunately, this meeting was not reported on, so there is no record of the proceedings.

Reflecting the new direction of the IRC, we find Anne Evans and Anthony Gifford offering to resign from the Executive Committee in April 1968 in order to make way for 'more coloured members'.⁴⁴⁶ By way of recommending the acceptance of the resignations, Cummings informed the rest of the Committee that they needed to ensure that the Council did not 'desire to remain an isolated, unrepresentative bureaucratic organisation'.⁴⁴⁷ The resignations were therefore accepted and the IRC entered a new era as a black-led, multi-racial, community-based organisation, albeit one which was beholden to white funding.⁴⁴⁸ The new Executive Committee featured Frank Bailey (Chairman), Dora Bullivant (Vice-Chair), James Cummings (Honorary Secretary and Community Relations Officer), Revd Wilfred Wood (Treasurer), Revd David Mason (elected member and later the Assistant Editor of the IRC's journal *Spectre*), and Pansy Jeffrey (co-opted member), amongst several others. Affiliated organisations included both the Notting Hill Social Council and the Notting Hill Group Ministry, and several other organisations such as the Notting Hill People's Association, the Adventure Playground, Universal Coloured People's Association, Toc H, and the Black People's Alliance.⁴⁴⁹

As of July 1968, the IRC began producing its own monthly journal: *Spectre*. The journal was to be a place where members of the IRC could put forth their views (and often this was done so anonymously), rather than be 'a sterile official hand-

445 Sawh was in the end withdrawn as a candidate as he did not have enough support and he and Bailey decided not to waste the £150 deposit. 'Race Peace Talk in Pub', *Kensington Post*, 23 February 1968, p. 1. 'South Kensington By-Election Warms Up. Enter Roy Sawh', *Kensington Post*, 1 March 1968, p. 2. 'Black Power Contest Council. "It's time we drew together"', *Kensington Post*, 15 March 1968, p. 10.

446 At that point, only three of the 12 members were people of colour. 'More Coloured Members on Inter-Racial Council?', *Kensington Post*, 26 April 1968, p. 1.

447 'More Coloured Members on Inter-Racial Council?', *Kensington Post*, 26 April 1968, p. 1.

448 The IRC considered itself an independent body, yet was funded by a grant from NCCI and Kensington and Chelsea Council. Three Borough Councillors also sat on the Executive Committee. 'A Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, July 1968.

449 Mason was also on the Education Committee alongside Donald Chesworth and John O'Malley. Other members of the NHMC were involved with the IRC. 'Sub-committees', *Spectre*, October and November 1968. 'Credits', *Spectre*, January 1969. 'The New Executive', *Spectre*, August 1968. NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. 'Affiliated Organisations and their Representatives', *Spectre*, August 1968.

out'.⁴⁵⁰ The name chosen for the journal referred to how the IRC saw the figure of the black man. The journal said:

Over the centuries the black man has been drawn deeper and deeper into the vortex of white society, so that today he has become an integral part of the white sphere of influence. His presence may be ignored but not his existence, which is like a spectre haunting the social scene. The black man wants a fair share of the world he has helped to create. *He is implacable, impatient and demanding.* He will no longer be placated by the hypocrisy that makes law and order a sham, social justice a mockery and religion a skeleton which pious words and dogma will never clothe.⁴⁵¹

This explanation of the journal's name neatly encapsulates the shift in demands for racial justice that are shown throughout the thesis and which were vividly represented in the struggles for control of the IRC. A shift which occurred through the ending of black activists' patience. Furthermore, the events of the first half of 1968 show how a white-led, apolitical, liberal, integrationist organisation had effectively been decolonised from within.

Spectre and the IRC went on to speak forcefully against racism throughout the rest of 1968 and into 1969. Their concerns, as was common amongst black activists on both sides of the Atlantic, often focussed on the sites of everyday life wherein discrimination was most often faced: young people, police harassment, housing, education, and work. Despite still having several white people involved with the organisation, the journal was often fiercely critical of white liberals referring to them as 'bugs' or 'parasites' which needed to be 'exposed and exterminated'.⁴⁵² These 'bugs' were,

The women whose idea of race relations is surreptitious [sic] relations; the men who having lost their far-flung empire of black subjects still try to guide and rule them here. [T]he cliques that meddle in the private affairs of black people and use them as statistics to extract money from public and private sources – they all stand condemned for their corrupt opportunism.⁴⁵³

450 'Introducing Ourselves', *Spectre*, July 1968. Later, in responding to criticisms that it was too militant and alienating of white support the editors (one of whom was the Revd David Mason at that point) said, 'The SPECTRE was never meant to be a dull official hand-out or a local gossip sheet, neither was it aimed at placating the idiosyncrasies of those who choose to ignore the complexities of human relations'. 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, January 1969.

451 'Spectre', *Spectre*, July 1968, *emphasis mine*.

452 'Race Relations 1969', *Spectre*, January 1969. 'Comment', *Spectre*, May 1969. The repeated criticisms of whites did prompt an angry letter from former member Anne Evans: 'Letters to the Editor', *Spectre*, June 1969.

453 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, April 1969.

With the last sentence, the journal was in effect referring to the professionalisation of the 'race relations' industry.⁴⁵⁴ In particular, the editors resented how 'These parasites read a few books on the subject, go to a public meeting on race relations, stand up and say how strongly they feel about the injustice of the situation, etc, etc, and this is usually good enough to get them an invitation to serve on a committee'. Meanwhile, the voices of those who knew best about the experiences of racism were at best left unheard, and at worst lectured on 'how not to "antagonise the decent white people"'.⁴⁵⁵

The cynicism and anger directed towards white liberals as articulated in *Spectre* was linked not only to local experiences of racism, but also to wider national and international events such as the Race Relations Act (see below), world poverty, the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, Enoch Powell, and the white supremacist policies of Ian Smith's Rhodesia.⁴⁵⁶ Likewise, Britain's treatment of black people was compared unfavourably to other European ex-colonial countries, although France was excepted from this and seen as being akin to Britain.⁴⁵⁷ Importantly, and in contrast to more recent constructions of solidarity, it was noted that most of the racism in Notting Hill was practised by the Irish, Poles, Hungarians, Russians, and other white 'ex-refugees, immigrants and settlers, who, forgetting their own past (and how quickly some of them do this!) – become the worst offenders on the scene'.⁴⁵⁸

454 Jenny Bourne and Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Cheerleaders and Ombudsmen: The Sociology of Race Relations in Britain', *Race & Class*, XXI (1980), 331–352. Paul Gilroy, 'Managing the 'underclass': a further note on the sociology of race relations in Britain', *Race & Class*, XXII (1980), 47–62. Robin Jenkins, *The Production of Knowledge at the Institute of Race Relations* (London: Independent Labour Party, 1971). Goulbourne, *Race Relations in Britain*. Waters, "'Dark Strangers" in Our Midst'.

455 'Comment', *Spectre*, June 1969. This kind of lecturing was amply demonstrated in the *Kensington Post* editorial referred to in n. 442.

456 Dolphi Burkens, 'The Press and Race Relations', *Spectre*, January 1969. 'Only One Race', *Spectre*, December 1968. 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, February 1969. 'Comment', *Spectre*, June 1969. 'Asians: Protest to Labour M.P.', *Kensington Post*, 1 March 1968, p. 2. 'Inter-Racial Council work "undermined"', *Kensington Post*, 22 March 1968, p. 8.

457 Dolphi Burkens, 'The Press and Race Relations', *Spectre*, January 1969.

458 On this, the community activist (and cab driver) Pat McDonald, herself of Irish heritage, noted how frequently she had to kick racist Irishmen out of her cab. Additionally, Catholicism was labelled hypocritical by *Spectre* because of the attitudes of the local racist Irish in the face of pious pronouncements by Cardinal Heenan and the Pope. This is an important departure from more contemporary accounts which seek to construct discrimination against the Irish alongside Caribbean people in the sixties. A photograph of dubious authenticity of 'No Irish, no blacks, no dogs' is often used to 'support' these claims, but no evidence for such was found by this author, nor were adverts like this cited by the WIG. 'Comment', *Spectre*, February 1969. The Pat McDonald Memorial Fund, *Pat McDonald: Working Class Heroine* (London: The Pat McDonald Memorial Fund Committee, 1989), pp. 1–2. "'So Sorry, No Coloured, No Children'", *West Indian Gazette*, 3 (Aug 1960),

The representations of Christianity within the journal were more nuanced than the representations of white liberals, which was no doubt due to the involvement of Wilfred Wood and David Mason with the IRC, not to mention the fact that the organisation was housed in the Christian community house run by Toc H, and also held meetings in the Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre.⁴⁵⁹ On the one hand, Christianity was quite perceptively condemned for upholding and advocating standards of 'respectability' which prohibited criticisms of authority, thereby maintaining the status quo and curtailing social change.⁴⁶⁰ As such, whilst noting that the issue of 'race' cut right through the Christian community, it was asserted that 'racism is a cancer than needs more fundamental treatment than religion can provide to cure it'.⁴⁶¹ On the other hand, this perspective was tempered with reports of Christian action on racial discrimination, reminders of the universalising aspects of Christianity which taught to view all men as brothers, the citation of the arguments of Trevor Huddleston in respect of the relationship between colonialism and migration, and the recognition that the churches served as a unifying body for some (especially) middle-class Caribbean families. Finally, Christianity was also used as a marker when describing humanity, showing that it was still conceived of as a relevant force shaping the human personality and inter-personal relations.⁴⁶²

The pages of *Spectre* featured discussions on the Eurocentricity of taught history, and colonialism and the worldwide inequalities generated by the capitalist system; themes which were by then common in the speech of black and white anti-racist activists.⁴⁶³ However, the most sustained conversation pertained to the Race Relations Act of 1968. The first edition of *Spectre* laid out

p. 5. See also, John Draper, 'No Irish, no blacks, no dogs, no proof', *Guardian*, 21 October 2015, <<http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/oct/21/no-irish-no-blacks-no-dogs-no-proof>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

459 See Chapter Six for more on the Ecumenical Centre and Toc H.

460 Another article noted how tepid and lacking in initiative the churches had been in terms of the field of 'race relations', asking if the churches had not relied too much on the actions of governmental bodies working in the field. Alaba Memelik, 'On Respectability', *Spectre*, April 1969. Judie Minards, 'Churchmen Speak Out at Race Conference', *Spectre*, April 1969.

461 'Comment', *Spectre*, February 1969.

462 Jean Sargeant, 'Christian Action on Racial Discrimination', *Spectre*, May 1969. Revd Peter Clarke, 'Forum (Continued)', *Spectre*, March 1969. 'Only One Race', *Spectre*, December 1968. Judie Minards, 'Churchmen Speak Out at Race Conference', *Spectre*, April 1969. 'All men, black and white, Christian and non-Christian, are one people with one destiny'. 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, January 1969.

463 'Comment', *Spectre*, August 1968. 'Comment', *Spectre*, September 1968. 'Matter of Opinion: Milestone or Millstone?', *Spectre*, October and November 1968. 'Only One Race', *Spectre*, December 1968. John Donovan, 'Black and Proud', *Spectre*, May 1969.

the specifics and the mechanisms of the bill in layman's terms for their readers, and, whilst noting the loopholes and ambiguities of the Act, did take a cautiously positive position in respect of it. They said, 'Is this a good Bill? Considering that it has been produced by a Government which has enshrined blatant discrimination in its immigration laws, yes. It is better than one might have hoped'.⁴⁶⁴ However, the next edition carried an article with an entirely different tone equating one's perception of the bill with one's racialised identity and morals: hypocritical and immoral whites would view it in a positive light since 'it will not affect your privileged status in any way'; white chauvinists would view it negatively as they would interpret it as infringing on their rights; honest whites 'with a sense of dignity and self-respect' would feel a sense of shame and betrayal 'because so many of your pronouncements had produced so little'. However, 'if you are black and not [so] dishonest that you wish to live like a vulture upon the putrefaction of the white social structure you will laugh bitterly and look scornfully upon the facade of this half-hearted, apologetic contemptuous Bill'.⁴⁶⁵

Debate over the Bill went back and forth between an editorial line which saw the Bill as a millstone, and the airing of letters from white people which were critical of this stance.⁴⁶⁶ However, perhaps the most interesting and perceptive aspect of the debate was the editorial linking of a turn to Europe with a rejection of the Commonwealth as the British made 'desperate efforts to become "good Europeans"'. Moreover, this rejection and embrace was also linked to the 'national origin' clause in the Race Relations Act which was understood as a way of privileging and protecting prospective (and expected) white European migrants to Britain over black British and Commonwealth citizens, although Irish citizens were obviously also part of the consideration of this clause.⁴⁶⁷

464 'The Race Relations Bill', *Spectre*, July 1968. See also the following for a strong critique of the 1968 Act: Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', pp. 53–58.

465 'Matter of Opinion', *Spectre*, August 1968.

466 'Comment', *Spectre*, September 1968. 'Forum', *Spectre*, September 1968. 'Matter of Opinion: Milestone or Millstone?', *Spectre*, October and November 1968. 'The Race Relations Act', *Spectre*, October and November 1968. 'Comment', *Spectre*, December 1968. 'Comment', *Spectre*, April 1969. 'Race Act Not Strong Enough', *Kensington Post*, 29 November 1968, p. 3. "'Millstone" says Spectre', *Kensington Post*, 29 November 1968, p. 3.

467 'In this Act "discriminate" meant discriminate on the ground of colour, race or ethnic or national origins'. *Race Relations Bill*, Bill 186, (London: HMSO, 1968), p. 1. 'Comment', *Spectre*, September 1968. 'Matter of Opinion: Milestone or Millstone?', *Spectre*, October and November 1968. Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*, pp. 90–110.

Mid-way through 1969, the IRC was to find itself in difficulties due to its reliance on official funding sources alongside its critical and strident voice: the organisation was told by the Community Relations Commission (CRC) that they would need to accept a new chairman *and* a new constitution *and* register as a charity or face the loss of funds.⁴⁶⁸ These stipulations were designed to silence the IRC in three ways. Firstly, registering as a charity would obviously severely curtail any political agitations. Secondly, the constitution aspect affected membership of the IRC. At that time, the IRC contained a high proportion of individual members (312 individuals and 10 organisations), but the new rules were to restrict individual membership to a quarter of the total organisational membership, thereby essentially crushing the organisation as it was presently constituted. Thirdly, the IRC were told that the chairman had to be a Kensington and Chelsea Borough Council member thereby ending Bailey's career in this role. Naturally, and likely accurately, Bailey perceived this as an attack on the editorial line he had taken in *Spectre*, and therefore stated that the new membership and chairmanship rules were an attempt to control the IRC as they had been too critical.⁴⁶⁹ In a further blow, the Liaison Officer, James Cummings, quit in October 1969 citing his reasons as the "social opportunism and lip service paid to race relations, which have resulted in economic, social and political advancement being provided for the few at the price of unhappiness for the many".⁴⁷⁰ Therefore, as 1970 arrived, the IRC was on the verge of collapse. Indeed, even with a change in membership and chairmanship, without a Liaison Officer no CRC grant would be available which would mean the IRC would be forced to fold.⁴⁷¹

The IRC is then an interesting case study in terms of the relationship between seeking to be both an authentic and critical black voice and an official body

468 The CRC was a provision of the 1968 Race Relations Act and was created to encourage and nationally coordinate 'harmonious community relations'. *Race Relations Bill*, Bill 186, p. 15.

469 RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Council Agenda for Tuesday 9 December 1969, Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council – Grant, pp. 639–641. Joe White, 'Threat to Inter-Racial Council. "Revise Constitution or Lose Grant"', *Kensington Post*, 8 August 1969, p. 7. 'Row at Inter-Racial Council. What Future for Bailey?', *Kensington Post*, 14 November 1969, p. 3.

470 Joe White, 'Cummings Quits the Inter-Racial Council. "Lip service paid to race relations"', *Kensington Post*, 10 October 1969, p. 5.

471 '1970 Round-Up', *Kensington Post*, 2 January 1970, p. 7. 'Frustrations behind west London clash', *The Times*, 12 August 1970, p. 2.

dependent on establishment funds.⁴⁷² In their excellent and fiercely critical chapter, Ann and Michael Dummett have shown how the formation of NCCI struck a fatal blow at the heart of the nascent civil rights movement in Britain. More than this, and deeply relevant to the IRC, they stated that the CRC emasculated local 'race relations' organisations in two main ways.⁴⁷³ Firstly, by tying grants for Liaison Officers to match funding by frequently hostile Local Authorities, and secondly by regimenting the structure of 'race relations' bodies to turn them into timid, conformist organisations controlled by those already powerful in the community.⁴⁷⁴ The organisations which were to receive funding were organisations '*without open membership*', and not merely containing but dominated by delegates of all the community organisations; linked very tightly with the city or borough council; and eschewing any course of action capable of giving offence to powerful or influential persons'.⁴⁷⁵

The Dummetts' further went on to state that the aims of liaison bodies, of which the IRC was one, was that of 'communal harmony'. As we have seen above and elsewhere, this was the aims of all 'race relations' groups at the beginning of the decade, and all establishment 'race relations' groups throughout the whole decade and beyond. The government was thus hanging onto an illusion, a myth which had been shattered in the eyes of activists like Bailey and Cummings. In this myth,

Conflict and confrontation were thus seen as evils in themselves; when mild suggestion would not correct an injustice, all that remained was to induce its victims to tolerate and "understand" that injustice. This latter process was called "helping the immigrant to adjust to his new

472 The internal revolution at the IRR is a somewhat similar tale in terms of the stripping of funding. See, Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Race and Resistance: The IRR Story', *Race & Class*, 50 (2008), 1–30.

473 Matthew Grimley notes that Wilfred Wood also later made this same accusation. Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism', p. 213.

474 The RBKC considered the IRC, alongside the Community Workshop, to be one of the most unhelpful organisations in the Borough. Geoffrey Moorhouse, 'The royal rotten borough', *Guardian*, 24 September 1970, p. 9.

475 It should be remembered that community organisations did not necessarily mean those representing the poor, excluded or marginalised, rather it meant any group that had self-organised in the area: from the rich to the poor, the white to the black, Christian and non-Christian, and any other group that existed in the locality. Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', pp. 63–65, quote from p. 63, *emphasis mine*. Similarly, Adam Lent's study of social movements notes six reasons for the decline in momentum of the social movements of the seventies, one of which was the acceptance of Local Authority funding. Alongside other detrimental outcomes, he states that the acceptance of such funds meant the curtailment of radical politics in favour of welfare or community service work. Lent, *British Social Movements*, pp. 173–178.

environment".⁴⁷⁶

When contained in this liberal form, these 'race relations' groups could be assured of positive press and liberal white support, but when not, they were at best chastised and at worst castrated. What the story of IRC shows then, is what happens to a black-led community or 'race relations' organisation which rejects the myth of tolerance and which refuses to allow itself to be emasculated through the mechanisms set in place by NCCI and the CRC. What happens, in the end, is destruction; and this destruction is, of course, another method of silencing, a refusal to hear critical black speech.

Conclusion

Reflecting on the myth of tolerance punctured by Powell's 1968 speech, the black community activist Lee Ackbar wrote to the *Kensington Post* that year noting that Powell had brought the racists who compromised ninety-nine percent of the nation out into the open. To wit, he asked who were the non-racist white one per cent of Britain, for it was this group of people who needed to go to the grass-roots 'and ask what the problems are – we know, we'll tell you. And when we've told you, you must accept our definition of the situation, and you must act to solve it. No debate, no intellectualising, we want action and now'.⁴⁷⁷ As we have seen above, this truth telling in and on the streets had been occurring in the area for at least a decade by the time Ackbar penned those words, but the ability of some whites to listen was truly compromised. It was compromised because the myth of tolerance denied the racism which forced whites to listen. Without this discrimination foregrounded, the discussion became one whereby 'races' must learn to relate to one another as they were, which meant an acceptance of inequality and injustice as central to black lives.

To this end, one suspects that the short-lived failures which constituted the early 'harmony'-oriented 'race relations' projects failed precisely because many liberal white 'do gooders' refused to hear these truths. Or, because the truths the whites sought to harmonise with did not resonate with their assumptions about black lives and black humanity. However, it is also clear that some of the more radical white activists of the area *had* heard those voices, had indeed practised

476 Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', p. 64.

477 Lee Ackbar, 'An appeal to the "non-racist one per cent"', *Kensington Post*, 10 May 1968, p. 21.

what Les Back calls 'the art of listening', and therefore sought to incorporate black needs and perspectives into their campaigns on housing to improve the social conditions of their lives as a community of neighbours across racialised lines.⁴⁷⁸ As well as in the examples above, this ability to listen was something demonstrated in the previous chapter in terms of the restructuring of the NHMC undertaken by the Team Ministry, and will be evidenced in the following chapter by the NHSC.

In a wider sense in terms of how the local press sought to portray community politics, *who* had been heard, and what tenor and authority had been given to their voices, generally tended to undermine a black grass-roots point of view. Therefore, in order to hear, one *had* to go out into the community as the voices of the black working-class were not given permanent and authoritative space within the local press. Moreover, as the IRC's story grimly illustrates, they were certainly not allowed to flourish within official 'race relations' organisations either. What this shows is that the confluence of power and authority led to the promotion of an official liberal, integrationist line steeped in the myth of tolerance, which was utterly out of step with the politics of the second half of the decade.

478 Les Back, *The Art of Listening* (Oxford: Berg, 2007).

Chapter Four: Notting Hill Social Council – The Politics and Partnerships of the Church

In terms of the division of labour within the Team Ministry, the Notting Hill Social Council (NHSC) was Revd David Mason's project. Being founded in November 1960, the NHSC was one of the first things that Mason did upon his appointment as minister of the Notting Hill Methodist Church (NHMC). It was to be an organisation through which local people could 'join together in the fight for better housing, better education, better health provision and better deals for Black and other new-comers to the Notting Hill area'.⁴⁷⁹ It was then the 'secular' and political wing of the church designed to provide a space whereby *all* members of the wider Notting Hill community, both as individuals and as organisations, could come together to effect change. This aspect of partnership is a key point and was paradigmatic to the life of the Social Council: for whilst it was rooted in a particular socially conscious theology, the Team Ministry believed that it would be a 'retrograde step' were they only to work with other Christians.⁴⁸⁰

Therefore, like its inspiration the East Harlem Protestant Parish, the point of the Social Council was to reach beyond the borders of the church building and engage with the community at large. This border crossing meant that, despite the Christian roots and chairmanship of the Social Council, and despite the many other Christian figures and organisations involved, the Social Council tended to utilise secular voices of authority when talking about social problems, 'race relations' or otherwise. This is not to devalue the Christian origins and inspiration of the work of the Social Council, but rather to underscore the symbiosis between so-called 'secular' and Christian points of view. As Sam Brewitt-Taylor has shown in respect of the Church of England, the 1960s saw Christian radicals embarking on a project of restating the Gospel and they often drew from 'secular' sources 'to construct a Christianity which could flourish in the new era'.⁴⁸¹ Mason and his Group Ministerial colleagues were a part of this moment of Christian radicalism and the Social Council represents an excellent example of the ways in which Christians synthesised Christian and secular

479 KCSC, Norwyn Denny, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 26 August 1985.

480 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 18–19, 25.

481 Brewitt-Taylor, "Christian Radicalism", pp. 18–79, quote from p. 43.

sources of authority in order to effect change and work for the social good.

As a lifelong member of the Labour Party, Mason's politics were of deep importance to him. Moreover, as was noted in Chapter Two, he was deeply influenced by the Christianity of Donald Soper which was of a politically and socially engaged variety.⁴⁸² Soper in fact became one of Mason's witnesses when Mason refused the draft and became a Conscientious Objector (CO) during WW2. As a CO, Mason worked at University College Hospital for three years, initially scrubbing floors and later working in the X-Ray Diagnostics department. When he was released in 1947 in order to join the ministry, he was warned that should he leave the ministry without returning to the hospital, he would be sent to prison. Accordingly he said, 'right its prison or pulpit, so that's how I became a minister'.⁴⁸³

Whilst ostensibly a quip, the statement is telling and illustrates a fundamental doubt which would arise just over a decade later during the planning phase of the Team Ministry. Mason had entered the church with the idea of using it as a platform for his politics of socialism and pacifism, *a la* Soper's brand of Christianity. Owing to this motivation, he was later to question the authenticity of his position within the church, expressing a fear of being an imposter due to a lack of certainty over his 'calling'.⁴⁸⁴ However, his Team Ministerial compatriot Geoffrey Ainger was to reassure Mason that 'an imposter's road does not lead from the breezy campaignings of Marble Arch [to ...] the serious participation in an attempt to seek the renewal of the Church in an area of radical failure'.⁴⁸⁵

These insights into the personality of Mason are key and help the reader understand the role Mason took on in the Team Ministry and in the setting up of the Social Council. As was noted in Chapter Two, a major point of the Team Ministry was to allow the individual talents, passions, and interests of each minister to flourish. Therefore, since from an early age Mason's passion was for politics and social justice, we are to find him establishing the Social Council and

482 Mason said, 'I came to Christianity through Donald Soper. Therefore, the organised church life that I knew as a boy of 17 or 18 was caught up in social work and political action of all sorts'. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

483 Mason, Interviewed by the author. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004.

484 In Protestant forms of Christianity, one's calling represents the knowledge/belief that one is called by God to a particular task or vocation.

485 NHMC, Letter from Geoffrey Ainger to David Mason, 3 March 1959.

through it, living and expressing the delicate balance between his politics and his Christianity.⁴⁸⁶ This opportunity to act out his Christianity in the world outside the church body led Mason to call the NHSC his 'free university', as it was during his position as chair of the NHSC in which he 'learnt first-hand about party politics, race relations, community work – the essential skills of the inner city'.⁴⁸⁷ Importantly too, his willingness to engage in politics was the key to the success of the Social Council and marked the NHSC and the NHMC out as different from many of their Christian contemporaries. As the *Colour and Citizenship* report noted, many churches had a fear of engaging in politics or political issues which led them to not be as effective as they could be.⁴⁸⁸ For the NHMC, this was not so.

The relationship between politics and Methodism is historic and was famously condemned by E.P. Thompson in his *The Making of the English Working Class*.⁴⁸⁹ Subsequent historians have sought to unpick and challenge Thompson's denouncement and show a more nuanced relationship between Methodism and politics and have found, even within Thompson's own text, a tendency towards radicalism on the part of some Methodists.⁴⁹⁰ Mason, the Team Ministerial experiment, and the Methodist Renewal Group more generally can be seen to be a part of this latter tendency. However, rather than concentrating on party politics, their focus was instead on the politics of everyday life as being the potential site of progressive change. As Brian Duckworth, a key member of the Methodist Renewal Group said,

The act of association, or identification, with the protest movements of our

486 To this end, fellow Group Ministry members Liz and Ken Bartlett remember that rather than preaching, Mason was 'much more turned on by local politics, the Labour Party, the Social Council'. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Liz and Ken Bartlett, June 2004.

487 KCSC, David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986. Mason continued on the 'race relations' path after leaving the Group Ministry in the early seventies and eventually received an OBE for his work as chairman of the South Metropolitan Conciliation Committee, Race Relations Board. Mason, Interviewed by the author. Supplement to *The London Gazette*, No, 46777, 30 December 1975, p. 11.

488 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, p. 371.

489 E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963, repr. 1977), pp. 385–440. *c.f.* Hobsbawm's account of Methodism and politics in Britain: Hobsbawm, 'Methodism and the Threat of Revolution'.

490 See, for instance: Roland Boer, 'EP Thompson and the psychic terror of Methodism', *Thesis Eleven*, 110 (2012), 54–67. Heathorn, 'E.P. Thompson, Methodism, and the "Culturalist" Approach to the Historical Study of Religion'. J.A. Jaffe, 'The "Chiliasm of Despair" Reconsidered: Revivalism and Working-Class Agitation in County Durham', *Journal of British Studies*, 28 (1989), 23–42.

time that reflect in a secular form the biblical priorities of justice, mercy, humanity and peace, is an important part of our missionary effort. We are in the fight for the sake of the cause. We are there to witness God's presence within it.⁴⁹¹

Similarly, the NHMC member and Social Council treasurer Stephen Duckworth (no relation to Brian) whose Christianity was informed by his time in the Student Christian Movement (SCM) and therefore also oriented towards the social wrote an article in a NHMC report entitled 'Politics is the next most boring subject to religion'. In it, Duckworth communicated the importance of a form of 'low politics' and informed the reader that 'Sitting back and taking no interest in politics is a gesture which only supports the system as it is. Change demands something more positive'.⁴⁹² As we shall see below, even if they were not always successful, the Social Council fought long and hard battles throughout the sixties (and beyond) in order to be and enact the positive change they were seeking.

The most famous English Christian to grapple with these issues of politics and Christianity in the sixties was Bishop John Robinson. Robinson's collection of essays, the title of which Chapter Two refers to, addressed in part what Mason himself called 'the ancient English heresy that religion and politics do not mix'.⁴⁹³ In the essay 'The Gospel and Politics', an essay from which Mason quoted extensively in his 1966 BBC *People's Service* Sermon, Robinson was to ask what it meant to know the Son of Man.⁴⁹⁴ In answer, he said that it was,

quite simply being concerned for food, for water supplies, for housing and hospitals and prisons. And if in our day you really think you can be concerned for these things, or rather for your neighbour in them, merely at the level of personal kindness and without being drawn into politics, then you are simply being escapist.⁴⁹⁵

Therefore, as Robinson was to state elsewhere, and the Team Ministry were to clearly take seriously, 'The Christian life, the life of "the man for others", must,

491 Duckworth, 'Mission and Evangelism', p. 33.

492 NHMC, Church and Community Report, 1969. When interviewed by the author, Stephen Duckworth commented on how after moving to Notting Hill in the mid-sixties, he rapidly came to a realisation of how political the social environment was. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. For what is meant by 'low politics' see the Lawrence Black reference in n. 375.

493 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 18.

494 NHMC, 'Going Out to Work by Revd. David Mason from the Notting Hill Methodist Church', *People's Service*, BBC Light Programme, 16 October 1966.

495 John A.T. Robinson, 'The Gospel and Politics', in *On Being the Church in the World*, by John A.T. Robinson (London: Mowbrays, 1960), pp. 133–139 (p. 138).

as Bonhoeffer insisted, be a “worldly” life. Yet it must be a life of “holy worldliness”, of “sacred secularity”.⁴⁹⁶

This worldly life of effecting social change was reflected both in the way the Social Council operated and in its constitution. The latter said the organisation was to strive for the betterment of social conditions in North Kensington, especially in reference to education, health, poverty, and sickness; and that it existed in order to provide a liaison service for those engaged in social service in North Kensington. In respect of the former, the Social Council is best understood as emphasising community partnerships in order to construct and facilitate larger coalitions which would be better equipped, and informed, to fight for community change. Without creating a false equivalency, the Social Council can be seen to operate in much the same way as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference who knew that larger coalitions with Trade Unions, other Christians, white liberals, and black folk were necessary in order to achieve the political change that black people needed.⁴⁹⁷

This coalition or partnership philosophy manifested in three ways: in the simple fact of the wide variety of people and organisations the Social Council worked with, in the specific way in which it operated, and in the fact that it chose its actions only after listening to the needs of the neighbourhood. These aspects are difficult to tease apart as despite having an official or core membership of primarily Christians and professional social, education, and youth workers, the way it operated – open monthly meetings designed for maximum participation from the floor – meant that individuals and organisations who were not a part of the official membership came and voiced their concerns and plans for action. The whole point of the Social Council was then to 'co-ordinate the different groups active in the district, and to bring together in a working relationship people who otherwise might have little in common, and thus to create a common programme of action'.⁴⁹⁸

This method of operation was critical to the Social Council's structure, and one

496 Robinson, *Honest to God*, p. 101.

497 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Proposed Constitution of the Notting Hill Social Council for formal adoption at the meeting on 8 June 1964. Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*, p. 6. Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, pp. 204–205.

498 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968.

would argue, the key to its longevity and its successes.⁴⁹⁹ Partnership was so important because in order to successfully fight any particular issue, Mason realised that,

it was crucial that there should be maximum co-operation and that key individuals should know and respect each other. It was no good simply the clergy and the social workers getting together. It had to include way-out black leaders, the Community Workshop, radical groups of all shapes and sizes.⁵⁰⁰

Whilst it seems that these various groups were not necessarily reflected in the core membership of the Social Council, what is clear is that through the open monthly meetings and involvement with various other community ventures, the Social Council was able to foster relationships with a wide-ranging section of Notting Hill communities.⁵⁰¹

The membership of the Social Council consisted of, amongst others, David Mason (Chairman), Stephen Duckworth (Treasurer), Donald Chesworth (Director), Pansy Jeffrey (Secretary), Philippa Astor (Isaac Newton School and Child Care Committee), Father Ivor Smith-Cameron (Anglican chaplain to University of London and, from 1970, Chairman of NHSC after Mason stepped down), Bill Richardson (Colville Tenants Association), Bruce Kenrick, and the Roman Catholic Bruce Kent.⁵⁰² Mason especially underscored the importance of Roman Catholics to the NHSC. In particular, he singled out the nuns of the Little

499 Given the instability of many community projects and activist groups, one of the most surprising discoveries in respect of the Social Council was that it continued operating until 2002, after which it merged with the Chelsea Social Council to become the Kensington and Chelsea Social Council, an organisation still in operation as of 2016. KCSC, Letter from Susie Parsons to Yohannes Fassil, 29 March 2002. Kensington & Chelsea Social Council, 'Celebrating 50 Years of the Social Council', <<https://www.kcsc.org.uk/50-years-kcsc>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

500 Mason cited these reasons as part of his contribution for a commemorative booklet planned, but never published, to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Social Council. KCSC, David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986.

501 See, for instance, the Social Council's involvement with Kensington and Chelsea's Inter-Racial Council in Chapter Three, their involvement with the Free University for Black Studies in Chapter Six, and their involvement with the Community Workshop in the 1967 Summer Project below.

502 KCSC, Notting Hill Social Council AGM - Speakers, 30 September 1985. David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, The Notting Hill Social Council – List of Members, n.d., c. 1961. Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. Mason, Interviewed by the author. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 18–19. Bruce Kent was an early member of the Social Council and was at that point the Roman Catholic Representative to the Kensington Youth Committee. Kent is known for his involvement in the peace movement, including his position of General Secretary of CND.

Sisters of the Assumption, who were also based on Lancaster Road and Fr Hubert Richards of Corpus Christi College on Denbigh Road.⁵⁰³ As will be clear from those listed above, the Social Council struggled to get sustained participation from working-class communities, black and white, and therefore largely remained a middle-class body in terms of membership.⁵⁰⁴ As Mason said, this is because 'the average working person was too busy doing their job to come to the Social Council meetings. They just didn't have the time'.⁵⁰⁵

As well as these core members, the Social Council also worked with official people and organisations like Mark Bonham-Carter and the Race Relations Board, the Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council, the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA), the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), and the London County Council (LCC) / Greater London Council (GLC). Moreover, its open door policy at the monthly meetings also meant the involvement of a much more diverse array of community activists who came in order to raise their concerns and seek support and advice for their projects. In fact, there were few statutory, voluntary, and community workers in North Kensington who did not have contact with the Social Council at some point.⁵⁰⁶

All of these people came together to meet and discuss, or debate and argue, through the monthly Monday meetings. The very structure of the meetings – a site of free discussion and debate – was also critical to the success of the Social Council. The meetings served as a way for the Social Council to *hear* the needs most relevant to the neighbourhood. Moreover, the meetings also served to widen the perspectives of the differing groups of people working in the area, by offering them a space to enter into debate with others and to agree on action through consensus.⁵⁰⁷ Importantly, Mason believes that the meetings were 'a safety-valve for activists in the community' and that their very structure of openness and of maximum and wide-ranging participation meant that, 'when

503 Corpus Christi College was eventually closed down in 1975 by Cardinal Heenan who did not approve of the liberal theology being taught there. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

504 Michael Rustin, 'Community Organising in England – Notting Hill Summer Project 1967', *Alta: The University of Birmingham Review*, 4 (1967-1968), 189–211 (p. 193).

505 Mason, Interviewed by the author.

506 See various Notting Hill Social Council Minutes in LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, and LMA/4462/P/01/003/002.

507 Consensus was felt to be the only possible way to operate when people from such diverse backgrounds worked together. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Notting Hill Social Council Conference, 20 April 1970. KCSC, Sid Miller, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 5 September 1985. NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968.

swift action was demanded, there was the backing and the know-how to respond effectively'.⁵⁰⁸ The monthly meetings were then the heart of the Social Council's work and 'the open secret of the success of the Notting Hill Social Council – certainly in the first twelve or more years of its existence'.⁵⁰⁹

For the first two or three years of the Social Council's existence, the meetings were held in the Lancaster Road Church's vestry. After which, as the meetings grew in size, they moved first to two different larger Catholic premises, until they finally settled at the Adventure Playground in Telford Road, thus embedding the debate and discourse in a space outwith the church body.⁵¹⁰ The number of people attending the meetings were approximately twenty to thirty in the early years, forty to sixty between 1964-66, and between sixty to ninety for the rest of the decade.⁵¹¹ Various local social workers have praised the Social Council and the monthly meetings as giving 'people who previously had felt it was hopeless to do anything the chance to take part in changing their environment', and as playing 'a vital part in helping to create the political will for action'.⁵¹² As Donald Chesworth assessed, 'more social action was to flow from discussions and meetings within its shabby portals than anywhere else in Notting Hill'.⁵¹³ Likewise, the Community Workshop member Michael Rustin noted that the Social Council was linked in one way or another to almost all of the social initiatives of sixties' Notting Hill.⁵¹⁴

Memories of the monthly meetings vary from praise of their 'friendly informality [which] fostered the development of contacts, helping to create greater awareness of each others' work and the problems being encountered'.⁵¹⁵ To alternate recollections of the meetings as being lively and full of 'fire and

508 KCSC, David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986.

509 *Ibid.*

510 The Catholic premises were the residential lodge of the Knights of St Columba in Lansdowne Road, and the Convent of the Little Sisters of the Assumption. NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968.

511 See various Notting Hill Social Council Minutes in LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, and LMA/4462/P/01/003/002.

512 KCSC, Letter from Greta van den Berg, n.d. c. September 1985, (first quote). Sid Miller, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 5 September 1985, (second quote).

513 DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962.

514 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 190.

515 KCSC, Sid Miller, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 5 September 1985.

brimstone' where debate, argument and questions from the floor were strong.⁵¹⁶ To this end, Stephen Duckworth noted how some of the partnerships between the Social Council and some of the groups which existed under its wing were sometimes uneasy. However, at the same time he felt that it was 'a very healthy conflict/tension' since very different groups within Notting Hill with quite different political beliefs and campaigning styles were able to work through the Social Council as a 'neutral body', albeit one with 'very powerful significance itself over the years'.⁵¹⁷

It is clear that there was some suspicion of the Social Council on the part of more radical activists. For instance, Susie Parsons, who was a community activist in North Kensington, noted that she was originally somewhat sceptical of the Social Council, especially of the social workers who comprised much of the core of its membership.⁵¹⁸ Jan O'Malley somewhat cynically assesses the role of the Social Council as a mediator between the Borough Council and other North Kensington community groups. She stated that the Borough Council viewed the NHSC as a 'responsible body' which it would talk to instead of having direct communication with other local groups.⁵¹⁹ At the same time, this working relationship, and the consequential pressure the NHSC was able to bring to bear on the Borough Council, the LCC, and government ministries, was also considered by others to be a significant factor in why the Social Council was able to achieve so much.⁵²⁰ This scepticism did lead Stephen Duckworth to suspect that some of the later partnerships between the Social Council and more radical community groups such as the Community Workshop were a type of entryism, whereby the Social Council's charitable status was seen as useful to the other groups' aims.⁵²¹ However, irrespective of any suspicions and

516 KCSC, Notting Hill Social Council AGM - Speakers, Diana Williams' Contribution, 30 September 1985.

517 KCSC, Notting Hill Social Council AGM - Speakers, Stephen Duckworth's Contribution, 30 September 1985.

518 KCSC, Susie Parsons, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, n.d., c. September 1985. Susie Parsons did eventually work for the NHSC and its successor the KCSC. For more on her campaigning work see: Judy Wilcox and Jenny Williams, 'Susie Parsons obituary', *Guardian*, 22 June 2015, <<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/jun/22/susie-parsons>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

519 O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, pp. 23–24.

520 KCSC, Norwyn Denny, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 26 August 1985.

521 The Social Council registered as a charity in 1964. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

whatever their motivations, radical community activists such as Ajoy Ghose, John O'Malley, and George Clark did indeed come to the monthly meetings to seek, and gain, support for their ventures.⁵²²

This emphasis on inclusivity does naturally lead to considerations of the overall membership and leadership of the Social Council along racialised lines. As was noted above, the Social Council did struggle to get sustained working-class involvement on an *organisational* level, and this is true in respect of black *and* white working-class people. In this way, whilst Pansy Jeffrey has concluded that it would be true to call the NHSC a 'multi-racial venture', it could not also be considered a 'self-help' organisation, since the people it was trying to help were too busy trying to survive to have any sustained organisational input.⁵²³ At the same time though, in confirming the Social Council as multi-racial in practise, Jeffrey did also say that black people were happy to make use of the various ventures which spun out from the Social Council such as the evening GP surgeries for women and children, the law centre, and the Notting Hill Housing Trust.⁵²⁴

It is true that hard times leave little space for campaigning or activism work as one is trying too hard simply to survive. However, given that the origins of the Social Council and the Team Ministry more generally was in the desire to combat racial tensions, it is somewhat disappointing that the Social Council of the sixties was a majority white organisation in terms of leadership. Indeed, the

However, it should be noted that, just as David Mason and Nelson Charles (NHMC parishioner) were part of the IRC, a Community Workshop leaflet does also list David Mason, Donald Chesworth, Pansy Jeffrey, and Nelson Charles as members of the Community Workshop, thus showing the interrelated aspects of Notting Hill activism, entryism or no. NHMC, *The Community Workshop In Notting Hill Leaflet*, n.d. c. 1968.

522 George Clark was involved in the Notting Hill Community Workshop and the anarchist-inspired London Free School. Ajoy Ghose was a founder member of the Universal Coloured Peoples' Association (UCPA) and one of those prosecuted under the Race Relations Act. In 1971, he was recorded as seeking the help of the NHSC for his Malcolm X Montessori Programme, or as it was later known, Fun With Learning. For more information on Ghose and the Malcolm X Montessori Programme see various minutes in: LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022 and LMA/4462/P/01/003/002. See also: Brian Lapping, 'Secular Black Brotherhood Launched in London', *Guardian*, 11 September 1967, p. 14. 'Three fined for Hyde Park race speeches', *Guardian*, 30 November 1967, p. 3. Myers, and Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education', pp. 509– 510. Bunce and Field, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain', p. 392. Waters, 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness', p. 128. Wild, '"Black was the colour of our fight."', p. 130.

523 This could possibly explain why the Social Council was unable to get any black people to reply to a request for contributions to their 25th Anniversary Booklet. KCSC, Draft Acknowledgement and Notes, n.d., c. February 1986.

524 Sanderson, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality', p. 165.

involvement of Pansy Jeffrey at the Executive level reflected the only sustained black involvement at this level. This failure to incorporate more black leadership is predictable for initiatives of this decade (and indeed, it is still true of the twenty-first century). It is amply illustrated in respect of a 'race relations' Liaison Committee set up in September 1965 which had Pansy Jeffrey as one of the five members. The Committee was set up as it was felt that, due to expansion of activities, the Social Council had lost sight of its initial aim of 'easing racial tensions'. However, the Committee soon stumbled as each member worked full-time and therefore did not have the time to devote to the initiative. As such, it was decided to try to recruit one black and one white worker to be retained full-time. The proposal for Donald Chesworth to function as the white worker once he took over the position of Director of NHSC was unanimously supported, yet there was no suggestion as to whom the black worker might be. Indeed, despite worries over the over-representation of white people on the Committee, a white-dominated leadership remained in place.⁵²⁵

In light of all this, it seems important to pay some attention to Pansy Jeffrey, who Mason describes as first-rate and crucial to the life of the Social Council. Pansy Jeffrey was from Guyana and whilst she first visited England in the 1940s, she did not come to live in London until 1956. She initially worked as a nurse and health visitor, but began working in 'race relations' work in Notting Hill in September 1959 where she was employed full-time as the 'coloured social worker' by the Family Welfare Association and based at the Citizens' Advice Bureau at 85 Ladbroke Grove, W11.⁵²⁶ Jeffrey's first report shows that she was clearly new to the area in general, but she identified housing and 'problems between individuals' as being the main barriers to 'good human relationships' and 'successful integration'. These issues, alongside those related to

525 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 December 1965. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 7 February 1966. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 April 1966. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Liaison Committee, 7 September 1965. 'Welfare Worker Reports: Immigrants becoming more adjusted', *Kensington Post*, 1 April 1966, p. 11.

526 The position was initially created in response to the white violence of a few months earlier. It was initially for one year, beginning in January 1959, and a Miss Baum-Achong was appointed first. Pansy Jeffrey took over the position in September 1959 after her predecessor resigned for unknown reasons. A similar position was created at the Lambeth CAB in 1954. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1958, Vol. LVIII, Inter-racial Problems, North Kensington – Appointment of Welfare Officer, 9 December 1958, p. 368. Davis, 'Containing Racism?', p. 126. Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country*, p. 103.

employment and young people were constantly stressed by Jeffrey throughout the decade.⁵²⁷

Jeffrey's report to Kensington Council in 1960 lists some of the projects that she was working on, one of which was a club for Caribbean mothers. The aims of the club were to bring Caribbean women together to undertake joint activities thereby enabling them to feel more secure. Jeffrey hoped this would eventually help the women to become more integrated into the community by hopefully leading them to join other organisations. The 'West Indian Mothers Club' first met in July 1960, just prior to Mason's arrival in the area, and was originally housed in the Lancaster Road Welfare Centre. However, for reasons unknown, Jeffrey later made contact with Mason regarding the Club and she noted that he was willing to cooperate in every possible way. He hoped that some of the Caribbean members of his church would also join and so offered the Club the unrestricted use of a room in the church four nights a week. The Club therefore moved to the church by April 1961 and hosted talks, a visit to a screening of *Black Orpheus*, and visits to other venues to meet other Caribbean people in London.⁵²⁸

It is clear that Pansy Jeffrey was not a political radical and, in fact, she counselled the NHSC to steer clear of radical community groups, citing the political aims of some of these groups as the reason why. Rather, Jeffrey's concerns, as reflected in the talks she gave, show a strong concern with educating white people on the ways of Caribbean people, an emphasis on the global aspects of 'race relations', and a strong emphasis on initiatives designed

527 Mason, Interviewed by the author. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1959, Vol. LIX, Inter-Racial Problems, 8 December 1959, pp. 413–414. 'West Indians – Mrs J. reports', *Kensington Post*, 31 January 1961, p. 1. Editorial, 'Welfare and the West Indian', *Kensington Post*, 20 January 1961, p. 4. 'Advising the Citizen in North Ken.', *Kensington Post*, 23 February 1962, p. 4. 'Warning of "Little Harlems" in W.11', *Kensington Post*, 17 January 1964, p. 1. 'Community Worker Warns of "Serious" Problem in N. Kens.', *Kensington Post*, 4 August 1967, p. 24. 'Meet Pansy Jeffrey', Notting Hill Housing Group's 50th Anniversary Website, <<http://www.nhh50.com/?people=meet-pansy-jeffrey>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

528 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/030, Letter from Medical Officer of London County Council to Pansy Jeffrey, 28 September 1960. Letter from Pansy Jeffrey to Miss Deby, 19 April 1961. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of the General Purposes Committee, 1958–1960, Family Welfare Association, Kensington Citizens Advice Bureau: Report by Mrs Jeffrey, West Indian Social Worker, for the year ending 30 October 1960. 'West Indians – Mrs J. reports', *Kensington Post*, 31 January 1961, p. 1. 'Notting Hill: West Indian Social Worker Urges Appointment of Assistant', *West Indian Gazette*, Vol. 3, No. 6, April 1961, p. 2.

to aid children. Radicalism or no, it is also clear that Jeffrey's counsel was widely courted not only by members of the NHSC, but also by experts such as the prominent academic Kenneth Little, and many other local committees and councils.⁵²⁹ For instance, she was asked to write pamphlets on 'race relations', to assist Michael Dummett and CARD (Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, of which she was a member) in respect incidents of police harassment and discrimination in the Notting Hill area, and she also attended National Council for Commonwealth Immigrant (NCCI) liaison meetings. As Mason affirmed, Jeffrey's knowledge and experience was invaluable to a wide range of people.⁵³⁰

Having considered the structure, people, and organisations involved in, and integral to, the Social Council, attention must now be paid to the activities which the NHSC undertook. Concerns over becoming merely a 'talking shop' led the Social Council to have a strong focus on the politics of *action* and it therefore initiated, and was involved in, a wide variety of social action over the decades. The ways in which the Social Council involved itself with many different groups, people, and organisations meant that it successfully embedded itself within the life of the community along multiple lines of action. Alongside the projects and experiments detailed below, there were also activities such as a legal enquiry on the relationship between the police and the community, the Golborne Neighbourhood Council, and many, many other projects.⁵³¹ These activities

529 Little asked her what he should include in his speech on 'race relations' for the NHSC conference 'The Migrant in the Community'. Jeffrey's three priorities were employment, accommodation, and social acceptance. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Letter from Kenneth Little to Pansy Jeffrey, 3 September 1962. Letter from Pansy Jeffrey to Kenneth Little, 10 September 1962. Letter to Pansy Jeffrey from Norwyn Denny, n.d., c. 1962.

530 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Notting Hill Social Council, Note on Meeting of Working Party, 2 June 1970. LMA/4462/P/01/001/002, National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, Minutes of a meeting of liaison officers, 2 September 1965. LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 March 1963. LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Letter from David Mason to Pansy Jeffrey, 28 February 1967. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of the General Purposes Committee, 1958-1960, Family Welfare Association, Kensington Citizens Advice Bureau: Report by Mrs Jeffrey, West Indian Social Worker, for the year ending 30 October 1960. 'West Indians – Mrs J. reports', *Kensington Post*, 13 January 1961, p. 1. See also the letters to and from Pansy Jeffrey in LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/032. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

531 The legal enquiry was led by Louis Blom Cooper and Rudi Narayan (both lawyers), and Donald Chesworth, and was set up after the Home Office refused to undertake a similar project. The Golborne Neighbourhood Council was a venture thought up in 1968 but undertaken in 1970 which saw the neighbourhood elect 26 representatives to the equivalent of a Parish Council. The idea was that this Neighbourhood Council would better represent the community to the RBKC, the ILEA, the GLC, the Met and so on. The NHSC came to sponsor it as of November 1970. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates

always sought to engage the whole of the community – black and white – even if they were not always successful in doing so. The three areas of the Social Council's work which have been chosen for discussion below are: Conferences and Speeches, Children and Young People, and Housing. This is because they reflect the predominant concerns of activism which had a focus on 'race' in sixties' Notting Hill.

Conferences and Speeches

The NHSC held various conferences in the first half of the sixties and regularly invited distinguished speakers such as David Pitt and Mark Bonham-Carter to give talks at the monthly meetings.⁵³² Effectively, one can view these kinds of activities as in keeping with the educative aspect of 'race relations' work.⁵³³

Below two particular conferences will be discussed, alongside talks given by Pitt and Bonham-Carter on the various immigration and 'race relations' legislation which was passed throughout the decade. However, before passing onto those aspects of the Social Council's work, there will first be a brief overview of the other ways in which the NHSC engaged with education as it pertained to 'race relations'.

The Social Council often found itself approaching education in academic terms such as recommendations by Kenneth Little during the 'Migrant in the Community Conference' (see below) that clergy, GPs, and teachers, etc., would benefit from classes on the sociology of 'race relationships' and the cultural backgrounds of the migrants. Other manifestations of the academic emphasis can be seen by Donald Chesworth's request to the University of Sussex's Politics department for research students to carry out work in Notting Hill.⁵³⁴

Newsletter, November 1970. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 7 September 1970. Notting Hill Social Council Conference, 20 April 1970. LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. See also the minutes generally in LMA/4462/P/01/003/001 and LMA/4462/P/01/003/002. DCA, PP2/49, Untitled Document on the Neighbourhood Council, n.d., c. 1970. 'Shock for Town Hall. A "Rival" Council?', *Kensington Post*, 8 November 1968, p. 1. 'Neighbourhood council to be formed', *Kensington Post*, 20 March 1970, p. 46.

532 David Pitt (later Baron Pitt) was a GP, Labour Party member, LCC member, and political campaigner. Mark Bonham-Carter was a Liberal MP, chairman of the Race Relations Board, and later chairman of the Community Relations Commission.

533 As Sara Ahmed notes, the discourse of tolerance assumes that anti-racism will come about through education, but this is not necessarily so. Ahmed, 'Declarations of Whiteness'.

534 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962. LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council: Liaison Committee, 30 January 1967.

Less formally, and probably inspired by a discussion on the Indian Workers' Association's English language teaching project in Southall at that time, the NHSC ran tutorial work for migrants out of the CAB offices in which Pansy Jeffrey worked. Additionally, in 1962, David Pitt drew attention to the racism of teachers, such as Colin Jordan of the White Defence League, which would inevitably affect and infect the children he was teaching.⁵³⁵

In respect of conferences, in the first few years of operation (1962-64) the Social Council hosted several: on housing, education and 'race relations'; the potential skills of young immigrants; and local leadership in the community. The conferences often featured academic speakers such as Kenneth Little and Sheila Patterson, and often illustrated typical aspects of the 'race relations' problematic.⁵³⁶ Of all the conferences hosted by the NHSC, two in particular have been chosen to study in further detail as they illustrate the racialised divisions within Notting Hill which were to hamper the Social Council's work throughout the sixties. The conferences chosen for discussion are the 'Migrant in the Community' conference, and a conference on 'the potential skills of young immigrants'.

The 'Migrant in the Community' conference was held on 27 September 1962, and was the first of the NHSC conferences held at the Lancaster Road Church. It was held in conjunction with the London Council of Social Service and was very well attended by nearly one hundred people. The conference addressed three main themes: the background to Caribbean migration, the problems encountered by Caribbean people in Britain, and the response of 'the

535 The particular problem of the racism of teachers was a point that Marina Maxwell still found necessary to argue strongly in 1969. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962. LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 April 1966. Maxwell, 'Violence in the Toilets'.

536 The presence of these two figures is significant in terms of their status within the academic 'race relations' field. Kenneth Little is considered to have written the foundational text of British 'race relations' with his *Negroes in Britain: A Study of Racial Relations in English Society* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1947). And Sheila Patterson is famous for her widely cited *Dark Strangers*. See, Bourne and Sivanandan, 'Cheerleaders and Ombudsmen'. And, Waters, "'Dark Strangers" in Our Midst'. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 July 1963. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 July 1963. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 30 September 1963. Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'Local Leadership in the Community', 12 May 1964. For the 'race relations' problematic see: Sivanandan, 'Race and Resistance'. Jenkins, *The Production of Knowledge*.

community' to the migrant. As will be readily evident, the topics chosen suggested the intended audience – people who weren't from the Caribbean – and, furthermore, they constructed a binary between the community on the one hand, and Caribbean people on the other. (A binary which was typical of the period.) The speakers of the day were Kenneth Little; the politician, activist, and GP David Pitt; and Donald Soper. Participants in the symposium included two Methodist ministers who had spent time in the Caribbean (Marjorie Watson and the Team Minister Norwyn Denny), and Pansy Jeffrey. Also present were Nadine Peppard, Philippa Astor, and Pearl Jephcott.⁵³⁷

The conference was opened by Donald Soper who underscored the normalcy and historicity of international migration, identifying sympathetically with the experiences of the 'stranger'. Soper then went on to locate the so-called 'West Indian problem' in slavery, and therefore underscored how Caribbean people were the legatees of European exploitation. He also underscored the proximity of slavery, noting how Caribbean people alive then were the great grandchildren of enslaved people, thereby disrupting narratives of a closed and finished past. Soper reminded his audience that Caribbean migration must always be understood in the context of European exploitation since the Caribbean 'had become an expendable unit of world capitalism to be used to promote the welfare of the great imperial powers'. Furthermore, and with great prescience, when linking 'race' and capital, he noted that the framework of capitalism could not provide answers to the problems provoked by capitalism. Soper, then, asked his audience to think differently about the nature and history of the world.⁵³⁸

Soper also underscored how Caribbean people had been told that they *belonged* to the Commonwealth – of which Britain was the head and the heart – but then found themselves subject to the 1962 Immigration Act. How then, he asked, was it possible to emotionally and psychologically 'integrate' people who had been so misled and so subject to defamatory speech? His answer was to focus on changing society at large into a multi-racial one, rather than to press

537 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962. Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. NHMC, Notting Hill Team Ministry Associates Newsletter, Advent 1962.

538 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962.

for 'integration'.⁵³⁹ Given that by 1962 society was already multi-racial in fact, one suspects that the change Soper was alluding to was in fact psychological and ideological. Much like the position of Revd Daisuke Kitagawa of the WCC given in the Introduction, Soper instead put the onus on perceived models of society to shift and change in order to reflect its new composition. Soper's point of view was a refreshing one given his status as a prominent white member of society since, at this time, the general emphasis was on the necessity of black people changing in order to fit in with a pre-established way of being.⁵⁴⁰

Pansy Jeffrey's contribution saw her resisting the idea of 'integration' and wishing instead for people to think about 'fostering relationships'. Rather than contrived situations (perhaps she was thinking of situations like James Baldwin's inter-racial cocktail parties and their 'rattling, genteel, nervously smiling air'), she thought that relationships should be forged where people normally mix, for instance in schools, work places, child and maternity centres, and so forth.⁵⁴¹ Similarly, David Pitt was of the commonsensical opinion that the abilities and interests of Caribbean people should be discovered so that they could be involved in activities from which relationships could naturally be formed between people with similar interests.⁵⁴² It is somewhat depressing, if not unusual, that white adults needed to be educated on how to form relationships and friendships with other people, and only serves to underscore the dehumanisation which occurs through racism, both in terms of those who experience racism, and of those who express it.

Kenneth Little, like many sociologists of the period, avoided discussion of white racism, preferring instead to call whites 'aloof', a position he continued to occupy during the 1969 World Council of Churches Consultation on White Racism as will be seen in Chapter Six.⁵⁴³ He also advanced the idea that the majority of Caribbean people were unskilled, rural workers less qualified than whites; that Caribbean people were unable to speak English correctly; that the

539 See Chapter Five for a discussion on the complicated and diverse meanings of 'integration'.

540 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962.

541 *Ibid.* Baldwin, 'Many Thousands Gone', p. 22.

542 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962.

543 In a contemporary parallel, Sara Ahmed also notes the reluctance of 'diversity' practitioners to speak about racism. See her, *On Being Included*, p. 142.

'biological consequences' of 'race mixing' need to be considered; and that, given the allegedly 'low class status' of migrants, they needed first to be raised up from this in order to mix with white people. Given these pronouncements, it becomes clear as to why Little refused to engage with idea or reality of white racism since it would require challenging his own, thereby undermining his authority to speak. Later he claimed that all prejudice needed to be countered, which, when added to his previous comments, provides a perfect example of the tension between what people believe about themselves and what they demonstrate to others.⁵⁴⁴

Little believed that the root cause of racism was economics and competition for resources. In contrast, in respect of 'push' arguments and the economics of the Caribbean, David Pitt – who it must be remembered was from Grenada – asserted that the development of the Caribbean would *not* stop Caribbean migration to Britain. In drawing attention to white racism, Pitt underscored how, whereas Caribbean people were prepared for it when going to the USA, lack of knowledge about British racisms meant that Caribbean people were not prepared for the reality of racism in the UK. In this way, he underlined the need for the government to make discrimination illegal, so that white people would stop being in denial about racism and would realise that it was 'an abomination that was not acceptable. If there were no prejudice immigrants would be able to fend for themselves'. In turn, a nameless 'West Indian speaker' noted that discrimination forced migrants to live in particular slum areas, which in turn made white people more inclined to look down on them. In turn again, this had made the migrants develop a sense of community and enclosed identities which might not have developed had they not been discriminated against in the first place.⁵⁴⁵

This conference demonstrated the division of black and white speech which was discussed in earlier chapters. However, what is also interesting is that, much like Trevor Huddleston (although to a lesser degree), Donald Soper was able to transcend this divide by his engagement with history. Fundamentally,

544 See Sivanandan and the Gunnar Myrdal disjunct comments in the Introductory Chapter. See also the following article for more on the complicated relationship between sociologists and 'race': Waters, "Dark Strangers" in Our Midst'.

545 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'The Migrant in the Community', 27 September 1962.

this division of speech was also indicative of the fact that, by the time the Social Council had come into existence, distinct racialised communities of people had already formed. Not only were these groups not really communicating with each other, but the existence of the entrenched groups also hampered the Social Council's work.⁵⁴⁶ To put it another way, endemic white racism – in both polite, middle-class liberal forms and crass working-class forms – had resulted in the construction of a boundary between a racialised white identity, or groups of white identities, and those who were racialised as other-than-white. Several writers have underscored how experiences of British racism have contributed variously to the construction of a West Indian identity, a black political identity, an Asian identity, and transformations from imperial loyalists into black nationalists.⁵⁴⁷ These constructions of essentialised differences, whether scored along 'racial', colour, 'ethnic', or religious lines are, of course, mandatory to 'race relations' discourse, as well as more contemporary constructions of multiculturalism.⁵⁴⁸ However, without wishing to undermine the importance that the identities hold for those subject to them, it is also true to say that the *foregrounding* of these racialised or religious identities which racism demands, also serves to ensure that people are approached purely, or at least initially, along these lines.⁵⁴⁹

This acceptance of the foregrounding of racialised identities hampered the work of the Social Council in various ways and is amply illustrated in the second conference chosen for discussion. This 1964 conference on the 'potential skills of young immigrants' had speakers such as E.J.B. Rose of the Institute of Race Relations, R.E. Phillips (High Commissioner for Jamaica), and G.A. Cadbury of

546 For instance, a 1964 conference in 'The Growth of Local Leadership' refers to the 'lack of integration' between differing groups such as West Indians and the Irish. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'Local Leadership in the Community', 12 May 1964.

547 Winston James, 'Migration, Racism and Identity: The Caribbean Experience in Britain', *New Left Review*, 193 (1992), 15–55. Bill Schwarz, 'Unspeakable Histories: Diasporic Lives in Old England', in *Philosophies of Race and Ethnicity*, ed. by Peter Osborne and Stella Sandford (London: Continuum, 2002), pp. 81–96. Henri Tajfel, and John L. Dawson, *Disappointed Guests: Essays by African, Asian and West Indian Students* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1965). Sivanandan, 'From Resistance to Rebellion'. Ramamurthy, 'The Politics of Britain's Asian Youth Movements'. Ramamurthy, *Black Star*, pp. 65–75. Modood, '"Black"', Racial Equality and Asian Identity'. Modood, 'Political Blackness and British Asians'. Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, pp. 62–65.

548 Ahmed, *Strange Encounters*.

549 As opposed to being understood as *aspects* of identity, they are understood as identity proper.

Cadbury Bros., amongst others. During the proceedings, it was recognised that there was prejudice on the part of the general public and employers in respect of employing 'young immigrants', but it was also noted that employers tended to rationalise it and not face it for what it was.⁵⁵⁰ The overall feeling was that, although strong lines should be taken regarding employers who discriminate, legislation would be hard to introduce and would not stop the discrimination. The Youth Employment Officer noted that it was as hard to place a 'coloured child' as it was a 'handicapped' one, and likened the situation to that of women at the turn of the twentieth-century. Eventually, they hypothesised, black people would be accepted as necessary the way women were.⁵⁵¹

Intent aside, the main problem with the way this conference was constructed was that it perpetuated the idea that the skills of the 'young immigrants' were in some *essential* way different from the skills of young white people. When in fact the truth of the situation is that the skills of *all* young people are myriad and what stops or assists them in actualising these skills are complicated and intersecting lines of discrimination and privilege. As such, rather than considering the skills of a particular racialised group separately from what, by suggestion, becomes the 'normal' or default group, *general* work with young people needed to have been expanded. This tactic would have required the youth workers to consider the similarities and dissimilarities of the whole, and to forge solidarities with the black youth to aid them in overcoming the structural and individual discriminations which inhibited the actualisation of their particular qualities and talents. In fact, by 1967, it would seem that these points were beginning to be understood by prominent Social Council members, since Donald Chesworth proposed a study of the gap between the ability and attainment of local school leavers, especially in respect of discrimination against black school leavers by employers.⁵⁵²

These kinds of divisions, and the disruptions, difficulties, and failures of inclusion that they caused are evident throughout much of the Social Council's work, especially in respect of youth work as shall be seen below. This statement

550 Many of these so-called 'young immigrants' wouldn't actually have been (im)migrants at all.

551 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 7 December 1964.

552 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 2 October 1967.

is not intended to discredit or dismiss the hard work initiated by the Social Council and its members over the sixties. It is clear that much hard and often frustrating work was undertaken in the face of opposition from the white residents of Notting Hill. Rather, it is an assessment that the sincerity and motivations of the Social Council members were not necessarily always a match for the entrenched viewpoints, boundaries, and divisions which had come into sharp focus with the 1958 violence, and often grew and hardened throughout the decade. Moreover, it is also an assessment that the very narrative of the field of 'race relations' is itself a part of the problem.

As well as specific conferences, the Social Council also invited prominent individuals to give lectures during their monthly Monday meetings. Given their emphasis on 'race relations', the NHSC were naturally concerned about, and interested in, the various nationality and immigration legislation passed in the 1960s, and therefore invited officials such as David Pitt and Mark Bonham-Carter to speak at different points. Since there bears a direct relationship between the white violence of 1958 and the 1962 Immigration Act it seems relevant to consider how some of the residents of Notting Hill responded to lectures on the legislation from such officials.⁵⁵³ For, whilst it is important to underscore that the 'riots' definitely did not *cause* the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act – for instance, eleven Labour MPs called for an immediate ban on migration from the New Commonwealth immediately after the Windrush docked, Cyril Osborne also called for restrictions in 1955 and 1956, as did John Hynd (Sheffield Attercliffe Labour MP) in 1954 – one can certainly say that they were used as a *justification* to pursue it.⁵⁵⁴

553 The myriad Acts have been subject to significant and sustained commentary and opposition both at the time and since so what follows is not a sustained critique, rather it is a study of how the Acts were discussed in an interested but non-professional context. See the following for more on the Immigration and Race Relations Acts of the sixties: Sivanandan, 'Race, Class and the State'. Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'From Immigration Control to "Induced Repatriation"', in *A Different Hunger*, by Sivanandan, pp. 131–140. Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*.

554 *Hansard*, HC Deb 21 July 1955, Vol 544, Cols 537–8. *Hansard*, HC Deb 19 April 1956, Vol 551, Cols 1160–1. *Hansard*, HC Deb 05 November 1954, Vol 532, Cols 821–32. Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party*, p. 119. See also: Bob Carter, *et. al.*, 'The 1951–55 Conservative Government and the Racialization of Black Immigration', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 6 (1987), 335–347. Robert Miles, 'The Riots of 1958: Notes on the Ideological Construction of "Race Relations" as a Political Issue in Britain', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 3 (1984), 252–275. Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*, pp. 131–169. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 213–214. Holmes, *John Bull's Island*, pp. 259–260. Winder, *Bloody Foreigners*, pp. 362–370. Paul, 'From Subjects to Immigrants'.

Upon invitation by David Mason, who wished for the NHSC to become affiliated to CARD, David Pitt came again to speak at a Social Council meeting in November 1965 in the capacity of chairman of CARD. Pitt told his audience that CARD was formed because 'race relations' in Britain had significantly deteriorated, so there was a consequential need to address and check this. The dual purpose of CARD was explained as being a base around which black people could organise to provide strength and morale, and as being an organisation which liberal whites could support in working towards 'positive race relations policy'. As did many black people at that time, Pitt rooted 'race relations' and 'multi-racial' societies in a global context: Britain was thus a local version of a global situation. He reminded his audience that Britain was already 'multi-racial' in that black and white people were already working alongside one another in various professions. He said that there were other examples in the world that the people of Britain could follow to assist in learning how to live and work together.⁵⁵⁵

It is clear that Pitt did not subscribe to the myth of tolerance as he was quick to underscore that there was still a lot of discrimination and prejudice in Britain to be countered. His position was that combating prejudice involved both long-term educational projects *and* short-term prohibitions. To wit, he informed his audience that one of CARD's first activities had been to lobby the government to legislate *comprehensively* against discrimination. Pitt expressed the view that legislation was about the education of the public in right behaviour: it existed to set a positive example. Together with effective *enforcement* of the legislation, Pitt believed it could improve behaviour. Therefore, whilst he believed that legislation could not *solve* the problem, he did believe that it could help educate people out of their prejudiced attitudes. This point of view was echoed by the Liberal MP Mark Bonham-Carter when speaking to a packed Monday meeting of approximately eighty people a few years later.⁵⁵⁶

The inadequacy of the Race Relations Act as passed in 1965 meant that CARD were campaigning to expand the current legislation to include housing, credit

555 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 October 1965 and Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965.

556 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 February 1968. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, March 1968.

facilities, and employment. Pitt's position was that the legislation as it stood might actually encourage discrimination in the areas not covered by the Act, as the lack of scope could suggest that discrimination was legitimate in certain areas. Similarly, when reporting on his attendance at a September 1966 NCCI conference entitled 'Our New Community', Donald Chesworth noted that the reason so few cases of discrimination had been brought to the Race Relations Board thus far, was because the Act didn't cover the areas which the Board had received most complaints on: namely, accommodation. In turn, Mark Bonham-Carter would later argue at a NHSC meeting that extending the legislation would end the ability of landlords or employers to base their discriminatory practises on the oft-cited fears of offending white customers and employees. Irrespective of whether or not this was subterfuge or the truth, Bonham-Carter argued that extending the legislation would eliminate the use of it as an excuse.⁵⁵⁷

When the Race Relations Act was originally discussed at a Social Council monthly meeting in 1965, a petition in favour of it was circulated but there was some feeling from the floor that the legislation would aggravate 'the situation'. This leads one to suspect a low level of black participation in Social Council meetings at that time, since there seems to have been unanimous support for the Act prior to its passing from black people.⁵⁵⁸ These protestations prompted leaders to remind the floor of the recently issued UNESCO statement on racial discrimination which underscored that legislation would make the official, anti-discriminatory point of view clear to the wider public. Seemingly though, this explanation was not enough as the idea that 'race relations' legislation would increase racism was still adhered to at the time of Pitt's visit six months later. Indeed, Pitt found his audience suggesting that the legislation could produce

557 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 3 October 1966. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 February 1968.

558 See, for instance, 'Anti-Racial Legislation: A Key Need', *West Indian Gazette*, Vol 2, No. 6, December 1959, pp. 4–5. Concerns about it as a tool for black oppression surfaced after it was passed when more black people were prosecuted under it than whites. Michael X (aka de Freitas) was in fact the first person to be prosecuted under the Act. Lionel Morrison, 'Planning for Britain's Black Community', *Race Today*, 1 (1969), 245–247 (p. 246). Ramdin, *The Making of the Black Working Class in Britain*, p. 447. Sivanandan, 'From Resistance to Rebellion', p. 17. Bunce and Field, 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain', p. 395. Gavin Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred: Meaning and Motive in Section Six of the Race Relations Act of 1965', *Twentieth Century British History*, 25 (2014), 251–275 (pp. 271–273).

greater discrimination which suggests that the Act was interpreted as a potential infringement on their (white) rights. Pitt's audience asked him if there was similar legislation in 'multi-racial' countries, which saw Pitt rejoin that the essential difference between a 'multi-racial' country like Brazil and a country like Britain, was the white majority status of the latter: Brazil did not suffer from white domination in quite the same way.⁵⁵⁹

The perception of the infringement of white rights that the protection and advocacy of equal rights for black people provoked points one to a construction of vulnerability or fragility on the part of white people; something also demonstrated in the letters discussed in Chapter Five.⁵⁶⁰ Indeed, when reference was made to the persistent attacks on black people reported to CARD, there was an interjection that white people got attacked too. Stating this simple fact – that white people were also vulnerable to attack – served to mask an important aspect of the types of violence reported to CARD. Namely, the racialised aspect of the violence – that black people were attacked simply for being black – as well as the structural and institutional nature of the sustained racialised violence that intersected with the instances of physical violence as enacted by individuals.⁵⁶¹ In this way, it becomes possible to see how attempting to equate *individual* instances of violence as experienced by white people with the racialised forms experienced by black people as *members of a group*, can actually be seen as a discursive device to mask the realities of lived racism.⁵⁶²

559 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 3 May 1965. LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965. This view of Brazil as a healthy example of a 'multi-racial' state was also repeated by Paul Foot in his *Immigration and Race in British Politics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), p. 233. However, Robert Gardiner, the then Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, instead noted that 'in Brazil, where race relations seem to be basically very humane, white is still the colour at the apex of the social pyramid and black at the base'. This latter opinion is also shared by more contemporary scholars such as France Winddance Twine. Robert Gardiner, *A World of Peoples: The Reith Lectures, 1965* (London: BBC, 1966), p. 30. France Winddance Twine, *Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Maintenance of White Supremacy in Brazil* (London: Rutgers University Press, 1998), pp. 111–133.

560 This vulnerability or fragility is triggered when some white people encounter challenges to their own racialised point of view and is displayed in a variety of defensive ways. See, DiAngelo, 'White Fragility'.

561 Violence here is understood as articulated by Obi Egbuna and Dom Helder Camara who saw violence as something greater than obvious physical offence. They saw poverty and starvation in a world of abundance, unfair distribution of resources, and substandard living conditions as a result of discrimination as violence. See: Obi Egbuna, *Destroy This Temple: The Voice of Black Power in Britain* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1971), pp. 103–104. Dom Helder Camara, 'Violence and Misery', *New Blackfriars*, 50 (1969), 491–496.

562 Ahmed, 'Declarations of Whiteness'.

Similarly, a member of the audience blamed racism on the habits and behaviours of some black people again failing to comprehend the interplay between individuals and projected group identities. Pitt's response attempted to highlight this by noting that 'bad elements' existed in all classes and racial groups. With this comment he was pointing out that trying to justify group-based discrimination on the basis of individual actions was not a logical or reasoned response.⁵⁶³

In his lectures, David Pitt continually refocused attention back onto the the reality of the problem: white racism. Indeed, he underscored how the 1965 White Paper on Immigration would pander to existing prejudices and was fundamentally discriminatory. When the integration of migrants was brought up, Pitt stated that whilst it was important to educate migrants on the 'English way of life', 'it must not be forgotten that the education of the white majority was more important than the education of the minority'. However, despite expression of these forms of racisms from the floor, we also find Mason noting that there was a strong feeling that the NHSC should affiliate to CARD and the Liaison Committee of the NHSC was to discuss any possible action to take.⁵⁶⁴

Children and Young People

The NHSC engaged in several activities which prioritised children and young people; young people in fact served as much a focus for the Social Council as it did with the NHMC and the Notting Hill activist community more generally. For children, the activities and actions ranged from country holiday schemes organised by Philippa Astor, a playgroup, and an evening infant welfare clinic funded by the LCC. This clinic saw a GP give his services free of charge to attend to the needs of the children of migrant mothers who were working during the day and therefore unable to bring their children to GP clinics during normal hours. This particular project proved so successful that two others were set up in other parts of London. Another highly successful project was the Adventure Playground. Whilst this venture pre-dated the Social Council – it was set up by Donald Chesworth in 1959 – the Social Council were heavily involved in the running of the playground and utilised it for the holding of their monthly

563 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965.

564 *Ibid.* *Immigration from the Commonwealth*, Cmnd. 2739.

meetings later on in the decade. Importantly, like the church's youth clubs, the Adventure Playground was considered one of the few genuinely 'multi-racial' youth spaces in the neighbourhood.⁵⁶⁵

In respect of young people, the Social Council again ran several ventures. For instance, there was a 'multi-racial' (staff and users) drop-in centre run by volunteer doctors with psychological training to help 16-23 year olds with housing, jobs, and other needed advice, and the Blenheim Project for 'out of town drifters'.⁵⁶⁶ Of all the work undertaken with young people, one particular project has been chosen to study in detail since it further illuminates the ways in which racism can serve to disrupt attempts to overcome it. The Portobello Project is thus an interesting study for it was one of the most enduring projects the NHSC operated. Not only did it outlive the sixties, but it also proved so successful that, by 1965, it was considered to be one of the best established experiments in unattached youth work in the country, and frequently cited as an example for use in other cities. Eventually the Portobello Project was taken over by the ILEA in the early seventies, although there remained a majority of NHSC members on the management committee (6 NHSC to 3 ILEA), including Pansy

⁵⁶⁵ In 1963, approximately three hundred North Kensington children went on holiday via this scheme. The playgroup was opened in conjunction with Save the Children in the basement of the church. It began as a part-time venture, but by 1964 it was open mornings and afternoons 5 days a week, overflowing into a second premises in North Kensington to accommodate the demand. Like many of the NHSC projects, it ran into financial difficulties in the early seventies, so Pansy Jeffrey and Revd Mason worked hard to raise money and support for the group. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 March 1963. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 July 1963. Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 July 1963. See also various minutes in same file. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Minutes of the Executive of the Notting Hill Social Council, 17 March 1971. Minutes of the Executive of the Notting Hill Social Council, 19 April 1971. Letter from David Mason to Pansy Jeffrey, 28 September 1971. Mason, Interviewed by the author. 'Advice Centre for Teenagers', *West London Observer*, 31 May 1963, p. 7. 'Adventure Playground Again for North Ken', *Kensington Post*, 6 November 1959, p. 1. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 8 December 1967, pp. 18, 43. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 17.

⁵⁶⁶ The Blenheim Project, which started in 1964, was aimed at young people over the age of 17 who had arrived in London with no jobs, contacts, or accommodation. It existed to offer stable relationships, practical survival information, emergency shelter, and counselling for young people. At certain points in its existence, it also provided emergency shelter for young people at the Christian community house run by Toc H, as well as training classes for voluntary workers on housing problems, local authority procedures, and health and welfare problems. As of April 2016, the Blenheim Project is still in operation. See its website for contemporary information: Blenheim, <<http://blenheimcdp.org.uk>> [accessed 16 August 2016]. NHMC, Church and Community Report, 1969. KCSC, NHSC Report: Blenheim Project, February 1977. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Memorandum on Activities taking place at Toc H Mark 1, 1969.

The Portobello Project was initiated in March 1963 in an attempt to respond to street gangs and otherwise 'unattached youth', by which they meant young people not in employment or training. Mason recalled that as well as attempting to work with local teens, they also tried to work with the teens from Hammersmith, Shepherds Bush, and Harrow Road who would descend on the neighbourhood at the weekend high on amphetamines, usually armed with weapons, and generally looking for trouble. Much as with other aspects of the Team Ministry's work, the direction of the Portobello Project was determined by first *listening* to the needs and wants of the young people they sought to help. The Committee felt that it was not enough to start facilities for young people and expect them to use them, rather the point was to make contact with the groups, gain their trust, and determine directly from them what they wished to see happen. As such, the first youth worker Paddy McCarthy – who was a former member of the Irish Guards, a Communist Party member, and considered to be 'avant-garde and unusual' – initially began by forming relationships with various gang members in order to determine their needs.⁵⁶⁸

Forging relationships with the youths led McCarthy to determine that the creation of a coffee shop would be the best foot forward. The youths were already frequenting other coffee bars which the Social Council considered 'less desirable' and so a space of their own was thought worthy. Premises were sought and found in the form of El Portobello which had recently been bought by the LCC as it was on the proposed route of the forthcoming Westway motorway development.⁵⁶⁹ Since there would be time between the acquisition of the site and its eventual demolition, the Social Council petitioned to use it for

567 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 March 1968. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 13 May 1968. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 7 December 1970. Minutes of the Executive of the Notting Hill Social Council, 6 May 1971. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Lent 1965. Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. KCSC, Notting Hill Social Council Annual Report for 1971. 'Welfare Worker Reports: Immigrants becoming more adjusted', *Kensington Post*, 1 April 1966, p. 11. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 22–24.

568 NHMC, Notting Hill Church Report, 1968. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004. KCSC, Notting Hill Social Council AGM - Speakers, David Mason's Contribution, 30 September 1985. David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986. DCA, PP2/49, The Portobello Project, n.d., c. 1963.

569 The Social Council were also involved in the later campaigns around what to do with the land underneath the Westway through partnerships with the Motorway Development Trust. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

their venture and secured it for a period of three years. In order to circumvent any vandalism on the part of the youths – something the young people warned McCarthy was likely – the Social Council brought them in to help decorate the café as it was felt that if the young people had some involvement and thus a sense of ownership from the start, they'd be less likely to vandalise it.⁵⁷⁰

Whilst the overall Project was in part funded by the LCC and the Borough Council, it is worth giving some figures at this point in respect of the coffee shop aspect, as in many ways it can be viewed as an early social enterprise. The rent for the café was £12.10.0d per month and it was to function on a membership basis which would cost the youths 7/6d per month to join.⁵⁷¹ Initially, there was to be no more than sixty members in the age range of sixteen to twenty-one. Each member could bring a guest up to a maximum of twenty additional people per night. The guests were only allowed one visit to the club, after which they should apply for membership. As well as being a coffee shop, there was also a jukebox, table tennis tables, and other such indoor activities in order to keep the youths interested and occupied. Access to a psychiatrist and a solicitor was also provided free of charge. Although there are no membership figures available for the period the coffee shop was open, it is known that 138 young people were helped in 1967 and 200 in 1968. As such, remembering that contact tended to be long-term, if it is assumed that the sixty monthly members were attained, this would have raised over £22.0.0 and therefore cover not only the monthly rent, but also, it is presumed, the salary of the youth worker.⁵⁷²

At first the project mainly dealt with young white people – only two Caribbean youths were involved as of March 1964 – and given the racism of young people as captured by *Universities and Left Review* in 1958, this is of little surprise.

This 1958 article published a selection of essays written by 15 year old school

570 DCA, PP2/49, Minutes of the Coffee Bar Committee of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 April 1963. The Portobello Project, n.d., c. 1963. Letter from Richard E. Stagg to Philippa Astor, 9 October 1963.

571 In 2014, £12.10.0d would be approximately £234 and 7/6d would be approximately £7. Figures obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

572 DCA, PP2/49, Minutes of the 'El Portobello' Project Management Committee Meeting, 9 October 1963. Report of Matters Agreed with the El Portobello Committee and the Management Committee of the Project, 9 October 1963. NHMC, Church and Community Report, 1969. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: May 1964 to December 1965, Vol. 1, Portobello Youth Project – Notting Hill Social Council, 18 March 1965, p. 233. Roger Chree, 'Helping the street corner kids', *Kensington Post*, 7 February 1969, p. 17.

girls from Notting Hill and revealed strongly voiced prejudices including standard tropes of the prostitution of white women by black men, desires for the repatriation of black people, and the alleged laziness and lack of hygiene of 'immigrants'. The essays are disturbing in their ferocity and violence given the age of the children, but do help the reader to grasp the ways in which black people were viewed by young white people at that time. In this same vein, Trevor Huddleston, who was living in Notting Hill at the time of the white violence and concerned with the welfare of young people especially through his position of Governor of the Isaac Newton Boys' Secondary School, declared that the young white people of North Kensington 'were more prejudiced and hostile than any Afrikaner youth group' he had worked with in South Africa.⁵⁷³

Reporting on what he called 'the grassroots reality of race in Britain', Colin McGlashan interviewed several young black North Kensington people for *The Observer* in 1967. McGlashan noted how friendships between black and white kids ended by the ages of thirteen or fourteen. The reason cited by the black youths was emergent endemic racism from their white peers. They talked of the impossibility of dating across colour-lines, due to shame and because both white and black girls were perceived as being somehow damaged, second-class, or even prostitutes for doing so. The youths also resented the way white English people did not speak their prejudice outright, unlike Americans who were viewed preferentially for telling it straight. Furthermore, the youths stated that to talk about the prejudice they received was to be branded as having 'a chip on their shoulder'; this led them to falsely deny experiencing racism when asked.⁵⁷⁴ In light of all this, the following children's skipping song reported on in 1970 is of no surprise: 'One banana, two banana, three banana, four. | Four Pakistanis sitting on a wall, | Along comes a skinhead, kicks them in the head – | Four Pakistanis laying down dead'.⁵⁷⁵

573 Norman Manley also remarked on the hostility of white children in Notting Hill. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 2 March 1964. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 March 1965. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 April 1965. DCA, PP2/46, Draft Manuscript 'Anatomy of Notting Hill', n.d., c. 1962. 'The Habit of Violence', *Universities and Left Review*, 5 (1958), pp. 4–5. Our London Staff, 'Solving the problems of race and colour: Jamaican Minister's Appeal', *Manchester Guardian*, 8 September 1958, p. 1.

574 Colin McGlashan, 'Growing Up With Pinky: Britain's black teenagers talk to Colin McGlashan about sex, race, class – and the English', *Observer*, 10 September 1967, p. 17.

575 Pendennis, 'Into the urban jungle', *Observer*, 23 August 1970, p. 30. The focus on Pakistanis as opposed to Caribbean people is typical of the shifts which occurred in racism in the late sixties and into the seventies.

Despite all this, and no doubt with much hard work by McCarthy, by April 1966, three years into the Project, things were showing signs of change. Paddy McCarthy had finally managed to attract a 'significant proportion' of Caribbean youth to the project, and he reported them as being 'accepted' by the white youths. Likewise, at this very same juncture, Pansy Jeffrey was to say that the Portobello Project was 'giving the lead to healthy race relations in the area'. David Mason also recalled that music, specifically reggae music, 'was a way of healing the rift between the black and white gangs'. The music served as a bridge between the two racialised groups: not only did the white youths love the music, but it provided the black youths with a form of social power as they educated their white peers on it.⁵⁷⁶

After the three years at El Portobello, and with a new policy to work without premises, McCarthy resigned and in January 1967 a new youth worker was brought in. He was an ex-Methodist minister called Geoff Bevan, and he was followed by the second youth worker, his wife Tric, in March 1967. A third youth worker, Terry Leander, was employed in February 1969 to work with black youths. Leander was a black Sociology graduate who had experience in youth work at the Methodist Youth Club in Dalston. By May 1969, it was reported that he was working with a group of approximately 50 young black people between the ages of 17 and 22. Leander noted that almost all were unemployed and that, whilst they were naturally concerned about this right after leaving school, he observed that they became resigned to their fate within a year or two. This reflects the findings of the 1966 PEP report which showed heavy discrimination against non-white school-leavers by employers, and is a depressing testimony to the power of racism to curtail the aspirations and life chances of those who are subject to it.⁵⁷⁷

Despite the 'multi-racial' successes since 1966, by 1969, racism had emerged

576 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 4 April 1966. NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with David Mason, June 2004. 'Welfare Worker Reports: Immigrants becoming more adjusted', *Kensington Post*, 1 April 1966, p. 11.

577 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, May 1967. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 1 July 1968. Portobello Project, Minutes of Meeting of Management Committee, 27 February 1969. Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 May 1969. Roger Chree, 'Helping the street corner kids', *Kensington Post*, 7 February 1969, p. 17. Daniel, *Racial Discrimination in England*, pp. 127–131.

once more, perhaps in response to the higher levels of black youth using the service. Bevan noted that the attitudes and views of the white youngsters would make it impossible to also work with young black people. He noted strong racial prejudice on the part of the white youths against people of colour, and that the prejudice was often viciously expressed. Bevan claimed that the prejudice arose partly from a 'perceived threat' and that it did not always take a racialised form. He said that it was directed towards anyone the youths deemed to be different to themselves, such as 'queers' and 'hippies' as well as black people. Rather than challenge this racism (or prejudice more generally), Bevan instead pandered to it and stated that separate provision of services and premises were necessary for black and white youths.⁵⁷⁸

A 1970 report of the Portobello Project related an example of racist discrimination experienced by one of the youths supported by Terry Leander. The youth went for a position of Junior Clerk on the advice of an employment agency and, after being shown the rudiments of the job, was taken to see the manager so that he could receive his start date. However, rather than allow the youth into his office, the manager met him on the stairs of all places, and proceeded to tell the youth that he did not have the relevant qualifications, was generally not suitable, and therefore refused him the job. This is all despite the fact that at no point prior to this were particular qualifications requested, nor was there any indication of his unsuitability when being initially shown his tasks. In their report, rather than naming the experience as one of racist discrimination, Leander and the Bevans noted the indignity and disrespect of being rejected on the stairs, and asked how the manager could possibly have known that the youth was not suitable? The report also noted how, with experiences such as this, it was no wonder that youths were reluctant to search for jobs. As such, the authors advocated keeping 'a list of employers favourable towards the employment of Black youths in their establishments [as this] would help to reduce immensely the feelings of futility and resignation which all but overwhelms the youths on most occasions when they go in search of employment'.⁵⁷⁹

578 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 5 May 1969.

579 This failure to challenge racism was also something his predecessor, Paddy McCarthy, was guilty of. During a discussion of the racism of Trade Unions and employers at a 1965 NHSC

In considering these points of view from people who are supposed to be supporters and caretakers of young people, they seem particularly troubling. It is perhaps this reluctance from youth leaders, and possibly from other authority figures such as teachers in school, to actively oppose discrimination which contributed to such a charged and divided racialised atmosphere amongst young white people. Young white people, it must be remembered, who would eventually grow into adults potentially in positions of power to further continue the discrimination. One gets the sense that the emphasis was more on protecting black youths from negative experiences rather than fighting to demand equal treatment. Whilst this desire to protect the young people from racist discrimination is an admirable stance, it does little to challenge inequality in a broader sense. Therefore, when one considers the educative emphasis on 'race relations' work more generally, it becomes possible to see a split between abstract discussions on inequality and failures to fight or oppose it in practise. This reluctance to tackle inequality head-on in tangible moments is yet another example how the problem with 'race relations' was its emphasis on right and harmonious relations over and above confronting the ugliness of racism.

Housing Activism

As was illustrated in the previous chapter, housing issues were an enormous problem for the working-class residents of Notting Hill, black and white. Not only was there the problem of inferior housing quality, but there was also the problems of exploitative landlords, subsequent overcrowding, and a shortage of housing in general. All of these problems were compounded when situations became racialised by landlords refusing to let to people of colour or by charging them higher rents ('the colour tax'). Concerns over housing were raised throughout the Social Council's meetings of the sixties, however focus shall be on two particular moments of activism: the Social Council's petition to Kensington Borough Council in 1962, and the Community Workshop led Summer Project of 1967. Whilst this second project was not led by the Social Council, they were heavily involved – Mason is described as having a 'crucial

meeting with David Pitt, McCarthy suggested that, rather than challenging the discriminatory practises of employers, young black people just shouldn't be sent to them in the first place. NHMC, Portobello Project, Notting Hill Social Council, Workers' Report to the Management Committee, April 1970. LMA/4462/P/01/003/002, Minutes of Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 8 November 1965.

role' by a contemporary – and it therefore demonstrates a good example of the partnership aspects of the Social Council's work.⁵⁸⁰

The 1962 petition was informed by the work David Mason, Donald Chesworth, and the Social Council more generally had been informally doing in this area. This included attempting to persuade tenants to take their cases to the Rent Tribunal, and more informal acts of support by Mason to his Caribbean parishioners, such as offering to be present when aggressive rent collectors were due. On a more formal level, the Social Council also wrote a letter to Kensington Council in 1961 requesting that they purchase houses for low income renting, prosecute landlords over failure to maintain adequate standards, and suggested the possibility of student volunteers taking part in a housing inspection. The letter was effectively dismissed by Kensington Council, but the Social Council's requests were to resurface again in the 1962 petition.⁵⁸¹

The petition made front page news in the *Kensington Post* in July 1962 to whom it was released in the form of a press release, alongside sending directly to the Borough Council. The petition was signed by 259 local people which included the former Bishop of Kensington, Donald Soper, George Rogers MP, twenty GPs and consultant doctors, fifteen heads of Kensington schools, former councillors of the Borough (both Labour and Conservative), Philippa Astor, the academic Ruth Glass, and various other academics, local clergy, and social workers. Whilst the petition was not necessarily unusual in terms of content – there was much concern over working-class housing conditions at that time – it is notable for the press coverage it received and the prominent members of society who put their name to it.⁵⁸²

Like the earlier 1961 letter, the 1962 petition urged Kensington Council 'to

580 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 190.

581 NHMC, Minutes of the Meeting of the Notting Hill Social Council, 2 October 1961. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

582 For instance, the LCC had researched housing in North Kensington, and Pearl Jephcott, a social researcher and member of the Social Council, undertook a large study on the social conditions of Notting Hill during 1962-1963 which was eventually published as a monograph entitled *A Troubled Area* and which revealed housing problems to be the most significant. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council, Press Statement, 19 July 1962. Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. Kensington and Paddington Family Service Unit, Survey of accommodation to rent in London, October 1962. The Notting Hill Social Council – List of Members, n.d., c. 1961. 'What the L.C.C.'s research team found in N. Kens. "Appalling" Homes and Higher Rents', *Kensington Post*, 20 July 1962, p. 3. "Act Now to Save Homes Breaking Up" – Plea to Boro' Council', *Kensington Post*, 20 July 1962, pp. 1, 5. Jephcott, *A Troubled Area*.

purchase such North Kensington properties as come on the open market' so as to safe-guard affordable housing for families as was being done in other parts of London. The NHSC focused on working-class families because it was also concerned about North Kensington 'becoming less and less a stable community of families and increasingly deteriorating into a transit camp'. In noting the considerable financial commitment that this would require, the petitioners also suggested that the Borough Council request special assistance from central government if necessary. They warned that without such official intervention, the social costs risked were: increased homelessness, children going into care, community breakup, and an increased financial burden on the State in the form of national assistance.⁵⁸³ It should be noted that the Social Council did not racialise the situation and the petition spoke for all working-class North Kensington residents, black and white.

As with the earlier letter, Kensington Council once again brushed off their requests leading Mason and Chesworth to state that this was 'a reassurance to every unscrupulous estate agent and speculator in North Kensington'. Because of the refusal of the Borough Council to take the petition seriously, Mason made Kensington Council's rejection letter and his reply public, and this was again printed in the *Post* as a front-page leader.⁵⁸⁴ The letters showed Edward Thom, the chairman of the Housing and Town Planning Committee, stating that 'You are asking us, in effect, to use ratepayers' funds to purchase properties for the exclusive benefit of one particular class of resident, and to endorse your view that other categories are undesirable intruders'. Mason's reply stated that the Social Council felt that families in dire need were deserving of support and that the only undesirable intruders in the area were the slum landlords and housing speculators.⁵⁸⁵ Bruce Kenrick also wrote to the *Post* pointing out that a housing speculator was on the Borough Council's side, whereas the class of people that the Social Council were on the side of was 'the homeless or exploited family

583 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council, Press Statement, 19 July 1962. Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. "'Act Now to Save Homes Breaking Up" – Plea to Boro' Council', *Kensington Post*, 20 July 1962, pp. 1, 5.

584 'Two letters tell the story of... The Housing Petition That Was Brushed Off', *Kensington Post*, 26 October 1962, p. 1. 'Here is is again... That Housing Petition', *Kensington Post*, 26 October 1962, p. 4. Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*, p. 6.

585 'Two letters tell the story of... The Housing Petition That Was Brushed Off', *Kensington Post*, 26 October 1962, p. 1.

with children'.⁵⁸⁶ Kenrick was highlighting that there are always sides in social policy and neutrality is almost always a fiction.⁵⁸⁷ Therefore, Kensington Council were indeed correct by stating the policy would benefit a particular class of resident – low income families – just as their policy of 'free enterprise demand[ed] that the weak go to the wall'.⁵⁸⁸

Much political mudslinging ensued. Edward Thom claimed that 'a Socialist used the petition as a stick with which to beat the Council at a public meeting' in an attempt to undermine the sincerity of the petitioners by attributing the petition to party political motives.⁵⁸⁹ At this same time, Mason himself was reportedly branded a Communist for his stance.⁵⁹⁰ That the petition could be attributed to left-wing politics was publicly disputed by two of the signatories who happened to be Tory ex-councillors.⁵⁹¹ A *Kensington Post* editorial stated that Thom was engaging in 'an attempt to smear the Social Council with red or pink colouring', which, apparently, was a very bad thing. That the sincerity of the petition was seen to be compromised if political motives could be attributed to it is interesting on two counts. Firstly, because it assumes that politics are an insincere form of motivation in that it implies that 'political people', or 'politics' as some *sui generis* entity, piggy-backs off any particular issue in order to further its own agenda. Secondly, because there are stark parallels made in respect of 'religious people' or 'religion', where one frequently finds accusations that it, or they, only care about a particular issue in order to gain converts.

In a spectacular rejection of any responsibility for providing low income housing, Kensington Council suggested that 'the formation of a housing trust would be the most appropriate way for the petitioners to implement their suggestions',

586 Bruce Kenrick, 'Whose side are they on?', *Kensington Post*, 9 November 1962, p. 4.

587 As Howard Zinn has argued, 'In a world where justice is maldistributed, historically and now, there is no such thing as a 'neutral' or 'representative' recapitulation of the facts, any more than one is dealing 'equally' with a starving beggar and a millionaire by giving each a piece of bread'. Howard Zinn, 'History as a Private Enterprise', in *The Politics of History*, by Zinn, pp. 15–34, quote from p. 24.

588 Bruce Kenrick, 'Whose side are they on?', *Kensington Post*, 9 November 1962, p. 4.

589 'Housing chairman talks of "dubious tactics"', *Kensington Post*, 2 November 1962, p. 7.

590 It is easy to underestimate the severity of the charge of Communism in 2016, but in the height of the Cold War, and levelled at a Christian, it should be seen as a strategic device deployed to undermine Mason's politics and authority within the community. KCSC, David Mason, Contribution to 25th Anniversary of Notting Hill Social Council Booklet, 4 January 1986. Colin McGlashan, 'Civil rights in W.10', *Observer*, 25 June 1967, p. 13. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

591 Anne Viney and Lance Thirkell, 'Readers' Opinion: "Political mud-slinging"', *Kensington Post*, 2 November 1962, p. 7.

which is perhaps where Bruce Kenrick was to first get the idea to start the Notting Hill Housing Trust.⁵⁹² In response to this complete abdication of responsibility, the Social Council were to say that, 'It is precisely this complacent, unimaginative element in your reply that most disturbs us when we measure it against the evictions, exorbitant rents and sheer squalor that we encounter every day'. Whilst applauding the work of housing trusts, they felt that the responsibility for the provision of housing was not the trusts alone, and that it should be complemented by a 'solid reinforcement' by the Borough Council.⁵⁹³

Eventually representatives of the Social Council and Kensington Council met in November 1962 in a cordial meeting wherein both parties' views were 'fully ventilated'. The meeting resulted in Kensington Council agreeing to look into the work that neighbouring St. Marylebone Borough Council had done in preserving low-rent accommodation. A follow-up meeting saw Kensington Council report that whilst St. Marylebone Council were still preserving some low-rent blocks of accommodation, in general there had 'been a continual diminution of dwellings offered for letting in the borough at comparatively low rents for persons of small incomes'. In practise, this effectively meant that St. Marylebone Council were generally in favour of cleansing the Borough of poor people, something which was considered 'both inevitable and desirable' by Kensington Council. Given the bourgeois status of twenty-first century Kensington (north and south), one hardly needs to read the minutes to know that in respect of the retention of low-rent accommodation, Kensington Council concluded that 'it would not necessarily be advantageous to adopt a similar procedure'.⁵⁹⁴

Despite the total failure of their aims, the Social Council were not entirely cynical of the outcome and stated that it 'did lead to a close working relationship

592 RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1962, Vol. LXII, Notting Hill Social Council – Petition, 13 November 1962, p. 384. See Chapter Two for more on this. Chris Holmes states that Kenrick steamed ahead with the formation of a housing trust as he felt that lobbying Kensington Council was not enough as they were so slow to act. Holmes, *The Other Notting Hill*, p. 8.

593 'Two letters tell the story of... The Housing Petition That Was Brushed Off', *Kensington Post*, 26 October 1962, p. 1. 'A Sad Blow – L.C.C. Member', *Kensington Post*, 26 October 1962, p. 5.

594 RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1963, Vol. LXIII, Notting Hill Social Council – Petition, 15 January 1963, pp. 20–21. The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1963, Vol. LXIII, Notting Hill Social Council – Petition, 14 May 1963, p. 190. 'Homes Petition to Get an Airing. Town Hall "Summit" meeting', *Kensington Post*, 23 November 1962, p. 1. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 19.

between representatives of the Social Council and the chairman of the Borough Housing Committee. It also served to focus attention on the urgency of the housing problems of North Kensington.⁵⁹⁵ Other observers were more scornful of the lack of a resolution to the petition, and noted how the Social Council went on to receive grants from the Borough Council after it 'stopped making quite such a fuss about housing'.⁵⁹⁶ On the one hand this criticism is valid – the Social Council did go on to receive several grants from Kensington Council – and there is no doubt that the awarding of these grants was aided by a favourable opinion of the Social Council on the part of the Borough Council.⁵⁹⁷ On the other hand, this also led to a greater level of respectability on the part of the Social Council which was to prove useful to the more radical community groups later on in the decade.⁵⁹⁸ So perhaps there was an element of capitulation on the part of the Social Council in dropping the housing petition, but at the same time, this could also be seen as an act of diplomacy given that the cordial relations with Kensington Council which ensued certainly assisted in furthering the efforts of other socially useful projects, including those of a more radical nature.

The Notting Hill Summer Project which took place between 29 July to 26 August

595 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964.

596 Jane Morton, 'New hope for Notting Hill?', *New Society*, 21 March 1968, pp. 416–418, quote from p. 418. Jan O'Malley was also quite scornful of NHSC claiming that it dropped agitation on housing issues after this petition, preferring instead to concentrate on less contentious youth projects after that. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 23.

597 For instance, from 1963 they received a £200pa grant for a part-time secretarial worker which increased by £50 each subsequent year. The Portobello Project received £1,200 for a social worker and £100 in running expenses. The Blenheim Project received multiple grants; for instance, £1,200 each year in 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, and £2,000 in 1968-69. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: May 1964 to December 1965, Vol. 1, Notting Hill Social Council – Grant, 24 June 1965, p. 363. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1966, Vol. 2, Notting Hill Social Council – Grant, 21 June 1966, p. 269. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: May 1964 to December 1965, Vol. 1, Portobello Youth Project – Notting Hill Social Council, 18 March 1965, p. 233. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: May 1964 to December 1965, Vol. 1, Notting Hill Social Council – Social Worker, 24 June 1965, p. 405. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1966, Vol. 2, Notting Hill Social Council – Blenheim Project, 3 May 1966, p. 233. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1968, Vol. 4, Notting Hill Social Council – 'Blenheim Project', 30 July 1968, p. 372.

598 For instance, it is likely that the Community Workshop led 1967 Summer Project got what little assistance it did from the Borough Council because Mason was the chair. The Summer Project received assistance from Kensington Council in clearing a site for play-space, £300 in financial assistance, the free use of Silchester Road Baths for the volunteers, and the use of a local school for accommodation for the volunteers. RBKC, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Minutes of Proceedings: January to December 1967, Vol. 3, Notting Hill Summer Project, 1 August 1967, p. 513.

1967 was intended to be an entirely different type of project. One which was to enable 'the *community* [sic] in Notting Hill' to come together and decide for themselves what strategies and tactics needed to be undertaken to effect long-term change in housing, play-space and any other aspect of everyday life they felt needed changing. In this way, the advertising leaflet couched its terms in ones of radical, grass-roots community mobilisation and empowerment, one which saw the 'ordinary processes of political democracy' as being unreliable in terms of effecting the kinds of changes deemed necessary to Notting Hill. However, at the same time, the language of the advertising pamphlet was still somewhat paternalistic: there was a knowledgeable and external 'we' which sought to mobilise a singular community of the disenfranchised which it had determined was in need of its help and knowledge.⁵⁹⁹

The Summer Project was inspired by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's (SNCC) Mississippi Summer Project of 1964 which was a voter registration drive utilising large numbers of white, middle-class student volunteers from the northern states.⁶⁰⁰ Rather than voter registration, which was obviously not relevant in the UK, the Notting Hill Summer Project sought instead to utilise the services of approximately two hundred white, middle-class student volunteers for three purposes.⁶⁰¹ These were: to compile a housing register, to set up play-space areas, and to set up three neighbourhood centres which were to be used as organising bases for the volunteers, as centres of advice, and as focuses of continued community action.⁶⁰² The Summer Project has been subject to two prior analyses by Jan O'Malley and Michael Rustin.⁶⁰³ Therefore, after briefly outlining who was involved, some of the problems encountered, and

599 SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967.

600 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 196. See the following for more on SNCC's Summer Project: Clayborne Carson, *SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (London: Harvard University Press, 1981, repr. 1982), pp. 96–129. CARD also undertook Summer Projects that year. See: Heineman, Jr., *The Politics of the Powerless*, pp. 173–175.

601 Although one might argue that working-class voter disenfranchisement in England is in some ways related to the aims of SNCC's Summer Project.

602 Just as the Mississippi Summer Project hoped that a legacy of 1000 student volunteers would be to develop and strengthen a home-grown freedom movement which would outlive the Project, so too was it hoped that the Centres would last far beyond the life of the Summer Project. Carson, *SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s*, p. 110. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', pp. 196–210. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, pp. 48–57.

603 O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, pp. 43–122. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', pp. 189–211.

the scope and findings of the housing aspect of the Project, the rest of the section will focus specifically on the racialised aspects of the Project.

The Summer Project was led by a coalition of leading community workers in Notting Hill, but dominated by the Community Workshop and the NHSC. In terms of leadership, the Community Workshop members were George Clark (Director) and John O'Malley (Organising Secretary). In respect of the NHSC, it saw David Mason (Chairman) and Norwyn Denny (Treasurer). However, there were many other Social Council and Community Workshop members involved including Geoffrey Ainger, Pansy Jeffrey, Donald Chesworth, Chris Holmes, Pat Smythe, Ilys Booker, and Michael Rustin.⁶⁰⁴ Unlike the broadly successful coalition politics of the Social Council, the diverse individuals involved in the Summer Project unfortunately resulted in splits, fractures, and disagreements both during the project itself and also two years later after the report was finally published.⁶⁰⁵ Therefore, whilst participants joked about their differences in tactics as being one of blowing up the town hall versus converting Notting Hill to Methodism, these differences almost certainly hampered the project's ability to create the change over time it desired.⁶⁰⁶

Whilst the project was a three-pronged affair, the main focus was on the compilation of a housing register. The organisers had decided on compiling a register of housing as 'a concrete, practical record of all the houses in North Kensington', something which was deemed necessary to know before conditions could be improved.⁶⁰⁷ The original plan was for two hundred students to survey 29,000 households in 11,000 houses or properties; in practise however, the project received one hundred volunteers, surveyed 8,243 households, and completed 5,406 interviews. The student volunteers were organised in groups comprising of twelve students and one local person who led the group in order to smooth over any outsider awkwardness. The

604 SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967. John O'Malley was the husband of Jan O'Malley.

605 As Adam Lent has noted, mobilisations beget mobilisations. As such, 'Division and dispute are a key feature of most grassroots movements'. Lent, *British Social Movements*, p. 5.

606 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', pp. 46–48.

607 Although, as Michael Rustin has said, it might well have been better to utilise Census data and then supplement with the information it did not cover such as rent figures. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 198. 'Volunteer force in big check on homes in Notting Hill. Father Borelli [sic] Here', *Kensington Post*, 28 July 1967, p. 1. Quote from: SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967.

volunteers stayed in a local school (the Isaac Newton School) for three of the four weeks, with the males moving into the NHMC for the final week, and the women into the Little Sisters of the Assumption convent. A work-camp team from the United Nations reportedly provided the catering. As well as committing to some degree of physical and social uncomfortability, the volunteers were also the source of the majority of the funding of the project. Not only were they to give up their time, but they were also to pay 30/- per week to take part.⁶⁰⁸

The vision of the organisers was grand, so they enlisted the services of university lecturers, local authority planners, professional researchers, and even a member of the Cabinet Office. This meant an inevitable professionalisation of the project which included obtaining the services of David Eversley of the Social Research Unit of the University of Sussex to analyse the data. They also obtained backing from the Ministry of Housing and the Nuffield Foundation.⁶⁰⁹ This academic involvement meant not only a two-year lag between the collection of the data and the release of the report, something which surely must have been an anti-climax for many involved, but also a professionalisation of the project with an inevitable turn away from community self-organisation towards academic objectivity and confidentiality. On the other hand, this professionalisation also ensured that both the project itself, and the subsequent report, made both local *and* national headlines.⁶¹⁰

608 SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, April 1969. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 43. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 198. 'Emergency plans discussed. Homes Project Volunteers Get Notice to Quit', *Kensington Post*, 18 August 1967, p. 1. 'New Light On Housing', *The Times*, 28 August 1967, p. 3. 30/- would be approximately £24 in 2014. Figure obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

609 Eversley was subsequently appointed to the position of Chief Strategic Planner for the GLC as a result of the survey. 'Summer Project Laid a Foundation for the Future', *Kensington Post*, 20 October 1967, p. 3. 'Slum Sensation Rocks the Council. Sir Malby in bid to delay publication', *Kensington Post*, 18 April 1969, p. 1. Jonathan Steele, 'Misery amid affluence', *Guardian*, 6 May 1969, p. 5. NHMC, Church and Community Report, 1969.

610 O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 52. For local news see: Roger Chree, 'Clark Plans Rent Register for Notting Hill', *Kensington Post*, 22 November 1968, p. 29. "'Summer Project' Goes to Council for Aid. Students in big housing probe', *Kensington Post*, 2 June 1967, p. 1. 'Community Action! Homes project launched at weekend conference', *Kensington Post*, 9 June 1967, p. 40. 'Volunteer force in big check on homes in Notting Hill. Father Borelli [sic] Here', *Kensington Post*, 28 July 1967, p. 1. 'Summer Project Laid a Foundation for the Future', *Kensington Post*, 20 October 1967, p. 3. 'Ultimatum to Council: Act Now on Slum Issue', *Kensington Post*, 9 May 1969, p. 1. John Clohesy and Joe White, 'Summer Project. The Hard Facts', *Kensington Post*, 9 May 1969, pp. 15–16, 49–50. 'Mass march planned after slum report published', *Kensington Post*, 2 May 1969, p. 1. For national news see: 'Housing squalor breeds violence', *The Times*, 6 May 1969, p. 2. Jonathan Steele, 'Misery amid affluence', *Guardian*, 6 May 1969, p. 5. 'Housing in a royal

The report was published on 5 May 1969 and perhaps unsurprisingly, did not find anything unexpected: just solid evidence of racial discrimination, overcrowding, and high rents.⁶¹¹ In terms of racism in housing, the report found that Caribbean households were the worst off: they suffered disproportionately from overcrowding and were charged much higher rents than their white working-class counterparts. Moreover, and familiar again to a twenty-first century London, the report found that it was the ubiquity of the private landlord which had led to so much of the housing problems. Nearly seventy-five per cent of households were privately rented compared to thirty-two per cent for Greater London as a whole; and further compounding this, furnished rentals, which commanded higher rents because they were not subject to rent controls, were at thirty-five per cent in Notting Hill, as opposed to four per cent in Greater London as a whole.⁶¹² Despite the fact that the findings were not particularly revelatory, the story was picked up by the national and local presses. *The Observer* called it 'one of the most damning records of social neglect in London since the days of Charles Booth'.⁶¹³ In their special four-page pull-out on the findings of the report, the *Kensington Post* was to say that 'It tells a shocking story of squalor and despair, and draws some conclusions that no Kensington man or woman can afford to ignore'.⁶¹⁴ As such, at the press conference on the findings of the report, David Mason was to declare, 'This report must raise the question as to whether the private landlord has outlived his usefulness in areas

borough', *Guardian*, 6 May 1969, p. 8. 'Streets of despair', *Guardian*, 6 May 1969, p. 9. TH Portlock, 'The Shame that is Notting Hill', *Guardian*, 9 May 1969, p. 10. Gillian Dalley, 'The Shame that is Notting Hill', *Guardian*, 9 May 1969, p. 10. Colin McGlashan, 'Civil rights in W.10', *Observer*, 25 June 1967, p. 13. 'New Light On Housing', *The Times*, 28 August 1967, p. 3. Jane McKerron, 'Notting Hill is Stirring', *New Statesman*, 22 December 1967, p. 870.

611 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, April 1969. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, pp. 119–120.

612 The report found that 35% of Caribbean households were overcrowded, despite being only 16% of the population. The Irish were 21% overcrowded and 14% of population, and the white British were 27% overcrowded but 52% of the population. This meant an average of 17% statutory overcrowding when it was only 2.5% for Greater London as a whole. It also found that 97% of rents of less than £1 per week (pw) and 80% of the less than £2pw were paid by white British. 31% of the £6-7pw rents were paid by Caribbean households. John Clohesy and Joe White, 'Summer Project. The Hard Facts', *Kensington Post*, 9 May 1969, pp. 15–16, 49–50. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 120.

613 The report referenced an 1889 book *Life and Labour of the People in London* by Charles Booth in which North Kensington was described as 'Godforsaken as anything' and stated that the same conditions and problems remained nearly eighty years later. John Clohesy and Joe White, 'Summer Project. The Hard Facts', *Kensington Post*, 9 May 1969, pp. 15–16, 49–50. Pendennis, 'Into the urban jungle', *Observer*, 23 August 1970, p. 30. Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (London: Macmillan, 1889).

614 John Clohesy and Joe White, 'Summer Project. The Hard Facts', *Kensington Post*, 9 May 1969, pp. 15–16, 49–50.

like Notting Hill'.⁶¹⁵ A question which is still pertinent today.

But what of attention to 'race' and racism? Unfortunately, the Summer Project was no different from other aspects of the Social Council's work which, as we have seen above, was hampered by the existence of racialised identities and un confronted racisms. However, whereas the petition of 1962 consciously and purposefully did not involve either the black or the white working-class residents of Notting Hill, the 1967 Summer Project was an attempt to actively involve and motivate the various working-class communities of Notting Hill. This was done in order 'to enable the community to make the connections between overlong social neglect and the social conditions of a twilight zone'. Moreover, people would 'be encouraged to organise themselves into community groups, in order that the work started can be continued and sustained throughout the long period that will undoubtedly be needed to bring about overall change'.⁶¹⁶

On the face of it, the Project began well. The Summer Project was launched at a conference chaired by Mason and held at the Ecumenical Centre from Friday 6 to Sunday 8 June 1967. It was reported that there were two hundred people in attendance from about fifty organisations. Attendees included students from Keele and Southampton, and academics such as Robert Moore and Stuart Hall.⁶¹⁷ Hall himself spoke on 'race and community', highlighting the dire situation of black people in sixties England and the need for society at large to start treating black people equally in housing and other social areas. Much the same as David Pitt two years earlier, Hall stated that 'race relations' in England were getting worse and intimated that 'a potentially explosive situation' was developing, a situation which he stressed should not be ignored. Hall underscored the scapegoat aspect of 'race' in that racist 'solutions' and

615 This was actually an echo of a point made by Donald Soper in 1962. Soper is recorded as arguing against leaving housing to private speculators because he believed that housing was a more important public service than schools or hospitals. As such, Soper believed that housing should be taken out of 'the rat-race of capitalism and put [...] in the forefront of the services which an enlightened community must provide'. 'London's Housing Squeeze. Manual Workers Losing Fight for Homes. Here is Basic Need, says Dr. Soper', *Methodist Recorder*, 6 September 1962, p. 1. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 120.

616 SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967.

617 Although not reported on in the media, there was also a discussion between Stuart Hall and Michael Abdul Malik (or Michael X / de Freitas) during this opening conference, a dialogue which Rustin saw as representing the political choices of the Caribbean community. Rustin also stated that even the mere presence of Michael X was enough to create 'some anxiety and hostility in the mainly white audience'. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 209.

'answers' were posed and created when communities were unable to solve their social problems. In this way, he hoped that the Summer Project would create the possibilities for 'a creative community approach'.⁶¹⁸

As well as the opening conference paying attention to 'race' and racism, the final of the four public meetings held during the month-long project was on 'race relations'.⁶¹⁹ Rather than a sterile and set seminar, this meeting was run as a 'teach-in' in order to get maximum participation from the floor. The teach-in demonstrated the willingness of the organisers to engage with racialised issues in theory even if, as shall be seen below, this did not translate into black involvement in the Summer Project more holistically. Information on the teach-in has been gained through local newspaper reporting, which, as was seen in the previous chapter tells us less about the content of black speech and more about how the speech was interpreted and received by the *Post's* reporters and editors.

The main voices recorded by the *Kensington Post* were that of Roy Sawh and Mrs Lee Ackbar. Sawh's point of view was the now familiar sentiment of black frustration with liberal whites, and a call for an end to white intervention in black lives: London was now entering the era of self-help. Similarly, Mrs Lee Ackbar stated that white people should cease speaking for black people since they did not understand them. She also informed the audience that

England was now faced with the problem of the black Englishmen – a person who was born and educated here. "This is the person who you have got to be interested in. You must be friendly with him and learn to accept him. He is not one of us, he is one of you".⁶²⁰

The concern for black youths was something the project came back to later on, and was becoming increasingly the main focus of concern for black activists. However, the most 'controversial' statement Ackbar made (in terms of how it was reported on rather than in content) was to call for black people to strike in order to show white people how reliant they were on black labour: a strike would significantly affect vital services like transport and healthcare.⁶²¹

618 'Community Action! Homes project launched at weekend conference', *Kensington Post*, 9 June 1967, p. 40.

619 The others were: poverty, housing, and community. SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967.

620 'Plea To White Liberals. "Leave blacks to help themselves"', *Kensington Post*, 25 August 1967, p. 3.

621 'Plea To White Liberals. "Leave blacks to help themselves"', *Kensington Post*, 25 August

Despite being generally supportive of housing activism throughout the decade, *Kensington Post*'s editorial line was severely critical of assertive black speech as was shown by their criticisms of the Inter-Racial Council in the previous chapter. The editor said,

It is discouraging, to say the least, to find a teach-in on race relations used as a springboard to for bitter attacks on white liberals. And a matter for regret that the teach-in should have formed one of a series of meetings organised in connection with the Notting Hill Summer Project, which has just ended. We don't know what the Race Relations Board will think of some of the more vehement statements made at this meeting – held in the heart of Notting Hill – but for our part we considered it right and proper that a newspaper covering the area should publish them.⁶²²

As well as 'vehement', they called the comments made by black people 'threats', 'sheer irresponsibility', 'a display of belligerence', and 'inflammatory'. When it is remembered that the 'vehement', 'irresponsible', and 'belligerent' statements were simply a call to strike and to be left alone to self-organise – as in, calls for self-determination and demonstrations of social power – it is true to say that the *Post*'s response was more than critical: it was dramatic, inflammatory, and somewhat hysterical. Interestingly, of all the statements made that evening by black participants, it was Mrs Ackbar's call to strike that incensed the *Post* the most. The paper stated that it hoped that calls for strike action would be condemned 'by the more moderate of immigrant leaders'. Despite not being a part of the organising team, the *Post* also claimed that the views of Sawh and Ackbar were not in the spirit of the Summer Project. As such, they felt that 'the organisers of the Summer Project should at once take steps to disassociate themselves from these ill-judged, ill-disposed remarks which could well undermine the vast amount of goodwill that exists here'.⁶²³

It is of course preposterous to condemn strike action in this way, a point which was not lost on readers as Cllr Bruce Douglas-Mann, Colin McGlashan, and Lee Ackbar wrote in. They pointed out that strikes were an integral aspect of English history and formed an essential tactic through which the working-classes were able to secure 'equal rights by responsible and democratic militancy'.⁶²⁴ Moreover, Douglas-Mann pointed out the inflammatory aspect of

1967, p. 3.

622 'Comment', *Kensington Post*, 1 September 1967, p. 6.

623 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

624 Colin McGlashan, 'Patronising goodwill not wanted', *Kensington Post*, 15 September 1967,

'confusing a proposal for a one-day strike with an incitement to violence', and also highlighted the institutional racism which would have ensured the editor of the *Post* would not have obtained his current position were he to have had the same talents yet have black skin. Alongside defending calls for strike action, black and white readers also wrote in to request that white people *listen* to black speech, as only black voices could adequately describe what experiences of racism meant and felt like. As Anthony Gifford said, 'It is better to speak and argue than to suffer and be silent'.⁶²⁵

Despite discussions on 'race' and racism punctuating the beginning and end of the project through these two public meetings, and despite a main point of the Project being to dispel racist myths over council housing queue jumping, black participation was, in the main, absent from the Project itself.⁶²⁶ This absence points to two things: white anxiety over the racialised climate in Notting Hill, and black dissatisfaction, disenchantment, and suspicion of white speech and white actions. In respect of the latter, Rustin suggested that the reason the black community rejected participation was less because the Summer Project was white-led and more because it was insufficiently radical.⁶²⁷ This would be in keeping with a reported generalised fatigue over being continual subjects of statistical and sociological analysis which served to promote the careers of white academics rather than improve the lives of the black subjects.⁶²⁸ Patricia Philo's point of view in the *Post* echoed this. In response to Clark's statement that he sought to use the collation of factual information about the housing situation to counter white racism, she rejoined:

Black people in North Kensington, on the other hand, do not *need* statistics to know they are not getting a fair deal. They meet and talk to each other, and they know they almost never come across anyone who

p. 12.

625 Colin McGlashan, 'Patronising goodwill not wanted', *Kensington Post*, 15 September 1967, p. 12. Cllr Bruce Douglas-Mann, 'Violence Compels Attention', *Kensington Post*, 29 September 1967, p. 10. Lee Ackbar, 'A time for plain speaking', *Kensington Post*, 15 September 1967, p. 12. Lord Gifford, 'Race relations "teach-in": Lord Gifford replies', *Kensington Post*, 29 September 1967, p. 10.

626 George Clark believed that a lot of racism was rooted in fears over housing – of black people allegedly jumping the council housing queue – so the Summer Project was designed to combat that by getting evidence to show the reality of the housing situation for black and white people. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 24 November 1967, pp. 18, 27. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 209. Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 8 December 1967, pp. 18, 43.

627 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 209.

628 See n. 536 above for references on the 'race relations' problematic.

has got a council house or a white-collar or supervisory job – and they know lots of their friends who pay as much if not more than the English for rotten houses or mortgages and can't get the kind of job for which they are qualified.⁶²⁹

In respect of white anxieties over the racialised climate, this seems to have mainly manifested by avoiding the subject of 'race' and racism in practise. Not only was there general anxiety in respect of the white, middle-class students from outside the community crossing social boundaries in order to deal with local working-class people of all racialised identities, but there were also fears that a 'racial incident' would be provoked either by Caribbean residents in order to embarrass the project, or by white residents if they were asked to give voice to their opinions as to what should be acted on.⁶³⁰ There was a sense that 'they were all sitting on a racial powder keg in Notting Hill and to organise a project in this way would be tantamount to setting a match to it'.⁶³¹ Therefore, when undertaking the survey, student volunteers were discouraged from arguing against older white residents who blamed the ills of the neighbourhood on black people as 'There was a degree of fear that an active stand on behalf of the West Indians would alienate the rest of the community'.⁶³²

This anxiety of being caught between white racism and black radicalism led to a silence over, and disengagement with, issues of 'race' outwith the two structured events. Much as with the 1962 petition, it was hoped that 'if one worked impartially for all residents on the outstanding issues of housing, playspace, and so on, one would be speaking for West Indian interests too'. However, by this point in the decade, Rustin remarked that it was increasingly difficult to involve Caribbean people in any community initiative unless explicit recognition and centrality to racism was given.⁶³³ Therefore, this generalised silence during the survey effectively meant a lack of black participation. In fact, Colin McGlashan reported that the lone black student who was involved gave up 'after three days of West Indian tenants telling him he should leave that sort of thing to white people'.⁶³⁴ In this way, the image of one black and one white

629 Patricia Philo, 'Notting Hill Today', *Kensington Post*, 24 November 1967, pp. 18, 27, quote from p. 27, *emphasis hers*.

630 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', pp. 200, 210. O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 50.

631 O'Malley, *The Politics of Community Action*, p. 51.

632 Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 210.

633 *Ibid.*, pp. 209–210, quote from pp. 209–210.

634 Colin McGlashan, 'Growing Up With Pinky: Britain's black teenagers talk to Colin

boy used on the publicity materials and badges worn by the volunteers 'was about as near to the issue as the Project came, and the fact of people walking round wearing this symbol came to seem naïve and ironic in the context of the Project's actual tenuous relationship to the West Indians of the area'.⁶³⁵

There is one further point to note in terms of 'race' and the Summer Project. Rustin highlighted a point of growth at the end of the project in respect of discussions over the hostility and racism directed towards young black youths by white youths. He said, 'People seemed able to take on, in connection with children and young people, issues of discrimination and even the necessity for separate identities which they had previously evaded'.⁶³⁶ This racism amongst young white youths is in keeping with the findings above but what is significant about Rustin's comment, is the ability of white adults to engage with, and accept, the realities of this. This is in marked difference to denials of racism and the construction of the myth of tolerance as has been highlighted throughout this thesis. As such, one wonders if the willingness of the adults to accept the racism of white youths and its consequences in terms of the construction of alternative, non-integrationist black identities, was due to the distancing afforded the adults by age. In other words, were the adults able to acknowledge the violence, able to condemn it, and able to accept its consequences because to do so was to condemn youth, rather than themselves? Much like the ease with which English whites could condemn apartheid South Africa or the segregationist states of the USA but yet refuse an acknowledgement of English racism, laying the blame amid the failures of youth (as opposed to their parenting skills) allowed the older whites to divorce themselves of responsibility and accountability and hence advance towards an admission of truth.

These criticisms of the Summer Project are not meant to be understood as a dismissal of the Project out of hand. Rather, it is considered that the Project is a good example of the difficulties of engaging in community work in the politically charged atmosphere of the later sixties. The Summer Project highlights a moment when some white activists were sincerely attempting to grapple with racialised aspects of community activism, but, at the same time, were acutely

McGlashan about sex, race, class – and the English', *Observer*, 10 September 1967, p. 17.

⁶³⁵ Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 209.

⁶³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

conscious not only of the racism of whites, but also of the frustrations of the black community who they wished to show solidarity with.⁶³⁷ This engendered an awkwardness rooted in an attempt to bridge, what seemed to be by that time, a seemingly cavernous divide. The awkwardness was also rooted in the reluctance to outright and persistently oppose the racism of a group they also wished to help. Perhaps then, the failure in terms of making the project truly inclusionary of *all* the groups within Notting Hill was contained with the language of that first leaflet: it talked of *a* community as opposed to a multitude of *communities* with conflicting and intersecting interests. Indeed, as Rustin later mused – perhaps separate work within each community was in fact already necessary.⁶³⁸

Conclusion

In sum, partnership was then key to the *modus operandi* and to the success of the Social Council. Despite being a Team Ministerial venture, and despite being theologically rooted in a social engagement of the church, the key to the success of the NHSC was that it spread itself out from its roots and cemented and forged relationships with as many social actors and agencies as it could. One is struck by the fact that Mason himself, and the Social Council through him, seems to have been involved in almost every social venture that took place in Notting Hill in this decade. The open forum of the monthly meetings effectively functioned as an open space to debate and discuss. These meetings meant that the widest range of ideas and schemes could be heard, should the group or person responsible wish to come, speak, and take part. Therefore, despite the shifts towards radicalism which occurred in the later sixties which offered new styles of activism and politics, the Social Council maintained an active involvement with these various groups by way of the open structure of the monthly meetings. In fact, one could argue that the Social Council's emphasis on working with others, irrespective of the splits and differences in

637 This was a balancing act attempted by the British left more generally as Evan Smith has shown in his study of the CPGB and the Trade Union movement. As Smith noted, the inabilities of the British left to adequately combat racism or show solidarity with black workers had led to autonomous black political organisation due to frustration with the white left. Evan Smith, '1968 – Too Little and Too Late? The Communist Party and Race Relations in the Late 1960s', *Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory*, 36 (2008), 363–384.

638 SDA, Notting Hill Summer Project Leaflet, n.d., c. June 1967. Rustin, 'Community Organising in England', p. 210.

politics which often affected other community groups particularly in the later sixties, is precisely why it was able to achieve so much. Moreover it is exactly why it still exists today, and it is therefore easy to see why Mason considers it to be one of the most useful endeavours the church undertook.⁶³⁹

However, despite these broad successes which are not to be underestimated, the work of the Social Council was hampered by racism in three main ways. The first, was the failure to incorporate black leadership outwith that of Pansy Jeffrey. Whilst, certainly in the first half of the decade, the hard grind of survival for many black people could go some way towards explaining this, this does not seem to have been so by the second half of the sixties. So it is disappointing to find the Social Council replicating white-dominated power structures when so much of its concerns were orientated towards black people. Providing people with opportunities for leadership is a way of dispersing social power and in this respect, an opportunity was lost. This is not to say that decisions were made through conscious acts of discrimination. It seems more likely that unconscious biases and reliance on middle-class forms of leadership were the cause of a majority-white leadership rather than a lack of available, willing, or suitable black candidates.⁶⁴⁰

The second is related to its reliance on secular voices of authority and secular conceptions of 'race relations'. By utilising these emergent academic discourses of 'race relations', the Social Council can be said to have been a part of the professionalisation of 'race relations' which has been strongly critiqued since. More importantly though, it meant that the Social Council relied too much on academic constructions of racialised groups. In this they were of course not unusual, but deferring to (white) academic authority meant that many of the ventures they undertook were not as successful as they could have been. This is due to the fact that they sometimes worked within the framework of the 'race relations' paradigm, rather than prioritising an opposition to racism. There is no doubt the Social Council viewed their engagement with academic 'race

639 LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Notting Hill Social Council Draft Annual Report, n.d., c. 1964. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 18–19. Mason, Interviewed by the author.

640 This point of unconscious biases was raised by Stephen Duckworth during an interview. Pansy Jeffrey did also complain of an over-reliance on middle-class forms of leadership during a 1964 conference on 'Local Leadership in the Community'. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/003/001, Report of the Notting Hill Social Council's Conference 'Local Leadership in the Community', 12 May 1964.

relations' experts as the most progressive line to take – indeed, sociological analysis is still considered in this way today – and certainly they were not regressive in doing so. In fact, the effort put in by the Social Council and the constant considerations of, and attentions to, the various needs of different racialised groups marks them out as one of the more progressive organisations of this decade. Certainly, and importantly, they did not subscribe to, nor promote, the myth of tolerance. However, given that the ministers had a philosophy of 'empty-handedness' and of *listening* to the people they wished to serve, and given that, especially by the middle of the decade black voices were specifically underscoring racism rather than 'race relations', it is unfortunate that the experts who were turned to for direction were not the voices of those who ultimately knew best.

What this shows is that, the main problem with 'race relations' work is 'race relations'. Meaning that, whether through the speech of elites, the construction of conferences, or the perceptions of interested people, assuming that there are 'races' between which relations must be made cordial does not much more than solidify boundaries and preach to the converted. The conferences and speeches hosted by the NHSC also show a marked difference between the speech of black and white experts and activists; differences which were sometimes transcended by white activists through an engagement with history. There is then in these conferences, a local example of a wider national problem which was discussed in length in the Introduction. Namely, by approaching issues of discrimination through the framework of 'race relations' the Social Council sometimes fell in with a broader narrative which fundamentally failed black people by scarcely ever naming the thing which called it into existence: white racism.

Part of this reliance on academic expertise can be explained by the fact that the Social Council was not a specifically anti-racist or even 'race relations' organisation. Rather, it sought to incorporate an attention to 'race relations' within its wider social and community work. On the one hand, an attention to 'race' (and gender, sexuality, mobility, etc.) *within* broader campaigns seems precisely the direction to take. On the other, in sometimes failing to take a strong, oppositional stance in respect of racism, instead preferring to protect or

shelter black youths from the effects of discrimination, the NHSC leaders effectively left racism unchallenged in several key moments. This leads into the final way in which the Social Council was hampered in its work: the social environment in which it operated. Time and time again, the hope and good will of the Social Council was hampered by the fact that the wider groups of (white) people it also sought to help were either hard-line racists, subscribed to the myth of tolerance, or simply refused to hear or respect black people's points of view. By the second half of the decade this had led to high levels of black frustration, and solidified racialised boundaries and the distance between groups, which made the Social Council's work much harder. To be fair to the Social Council, it is hard to see a way out for them in this respect when the poverty and injustice of *all* the inhabitants of Notting Hill was their focus. However, on balance the church community can be said to have been more successful in breaking down these racialised barriers than the Social Council.⁶⁴¹ This is because the supra-community of the church served as a unifying body in ways which the supra-community of 'the working-class' was unable to, because it was already too fractured by 'race'.⁶⁴²

641 This is something Stephen Duckworth also observed. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author.

642 See the following for more on 'race' and the working-class. Virdee, *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider*. Joanna Bourke, *Working-Class Cultures in Britain, 1890-1960: Gender, class and ethnicity* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 198–211.

Chapter Five: Racism in England –

The Postbags of Trevor Huddleston and Archbishop Ramsey

As was shown in Chapter One, Archbishop Ramsey and Trevor Huddleston made several public interventions in 'race' and 'race relations' debates throughout the second half of the sixties. To remind the reader, Ramsey's position was quintessentially liberal in terms of how he approached 'race relations'. As such, he received a preponderance of criticism both from radical left-wing activists and right-wing racists, and it is the letters from the latter which are subject to analysis below. Ramsey's letters came in two main batches: the first batch was in 1965 in response to his acceptance of the post of chairman of the newly formed National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI), and also in respect of his support of the new Race Relations Act. The second batch came in 1968 and were in response to his criticisms of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of that year, as well as a generalised anger directed at the new 1968 Race Relations Act. The letters to Trevor Huddleston were in respect of three critiques he made of Enoch Powell in 1968 and 1969. In common with many black activists of the period, Huddleston's interventions were rooted in history: in reminders of the consequences and debts of the legacies of slavery and colonialism. Moreover, Huddleston always took an internationalist position anchored in the universalising aspects of Christianity, and in a cosmopolitan awareness that global colour lines intersected with wealth and poverty in ways generally destructive to non-white and non-western peoples.

Whilst the 100,000 letters sent to Enoch Powell in the aftermath of his 'Rivers of Blood' speech given in Birmingham in April 1968 have been given some much deserved attention, the letters sent to Trevor Huddleston and Archbishop Ramsey have received scant attention indeed.⁶⁴³ Neither figure received anywhere near as many letters as Powell, but one suspects the reason for the lack of attention is less owing to this and more due to the aforementioned general omission of Christians and Christianity from social histories of this

⁶⁴³ See the following for an analysis of the Powell letters: Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, pp. 33–52. Amy Whipple, 'Revisiting the "Rivers of Blood" Controversy: Letters to Enoch Powell', *The Journal of British Studies*, 48 (2009), 717–735. Diana Spearman, 'Enoch Powell's Postbag', *New Society*, 9 May 1968, 667–669. Schofield, *Enoch Powell and the Making of Postcolonial Britain*, pp. 191–192. There is some discussion of the Ramsey letters in: Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism'.

decade. To wit, selected for qualitative analysis below are approximately fifty letters sent to Archbishop Ramsey, and approximately two hundred and forty letters sent to Trevor Huddleston.⁶⁴⁴

The letters arrived in a variety of forms: typed and handwritten, postcards and telegrams, formal and elegant headed paper, and voluminous scrawled pages on reporters' notepads. They were also penned by a cross-section of society: shop owners and workers, housewives, tradesmen, pensioners, vicars, and the aristocracy. Some of the writers wrote in a sane and rational form, others in a somewhat rabid and vicious way, and often persistently. Whatever the tone, it is clear that the letters served as a way of unburdening the writer by way of educating or attacking the recipient. A majority of the writers were women, probably reflecting a group of people not yet fully integrated into the workforce outside of the home and therefore with the flexibility of time to write.⁶⁴⁵ Similarly, many of the writers were pensioners. The letter writers were disbursed all over Britain: from great and small conurbations, to towns and rural areas. Whilst an overwhelming majority of the letter writers were pro-Powell, there were a few exceptions to this rule. However, the letters of support are not chosen for analysis below for obvious reasons: this is a study of articulated racisms after all.

There are some differences in the ways the letter writers addressed and communicated with each figure. Ramsey was always greeted respectfully – 'Your Grace', 'My Lord Archbishop', 'Sir' – and the writers generally carried on the letter in a respectful, if also sometimes patronising, tone. However, whilst Huddleston was also greeted respectfully by some writers – 'Sir', 'Bishop',

644 These are not all of the letters received. Owing to the focus of the thesis, only English letters have been chosen for analysis, but the postbags contain letters from people all over the British Isles and beyond. Additionally, only a representative selection of letters were retained by archivists at Lambeth Palace.

645 As of 1971, only 53% of women between the ages of 16-24 were in work. The sixties were, of course, before the Equal Pay Act (1970), the Sex Discrimination Act (1975), and the Employment Protection Act (1975). The sixties also reflect the beginning of the decline of manufacturing and the rise of the service industries associated with greater female participation in work outside of the home. Figures taken from: Office for National Statistics, *Full report – Women in the labour market* (London: ONS, 2013). This was also confirmed by Revd David Mason who noted that since 'their husbands mostly worked all day. It was the women who saw the black migrant as they bumped into them at the shops. They would moan to their husbands when they came home at five o'clock or six o'clock, "Oh, the bloody people there again today. I had to queue at the Post Office", like that, you see'. Mason, Interviewed by the author. Bill Schwarz also suspects that the majority of Powell's letter writers were women. See his, *Memories of Empire*, pp. 37–38.

'Father' – many did not even address him at all and just launched straight into an invective. Further, addressing Huddleston respectfully at first did not mean that the rest of the letter would continue in that tone: 'Sir' could be followed by 'you make me sick' or 'we HATE your GUTS' and signed off 'hatefully yours'. Many of the letters to Huddleston were also much more informal and emotional than those to Ramsey and the writers frequently underlined, capitalised, or changed the pen colour of words and phrases they wanted to stand out: 'hordes of immigrants', 'THERE IS NO GOD', '**HAIL ENOCH PATRIOT OF OUR BRITISH NATION**', and 'DOWN WITH THE CHURCH'. Therefore, whilst some letter writers were respectful in articulating their disagreements with Huddleston (and some spoke quite plaintively), many others were disrespectful, and others still conveyed a type of aggression bordering on violence.

As Bill Schwarz states, letter writing in the sixties was a central form of communication in a society which had not yet become dominated by the telephone (let alone electronic forms of communication). Of course, these racist letters to Powell, Huddleston, and Ramsey were not the first to be written: letters hostile to black migrants had appeared in newspapers from at least the 1940s, and in the postbags of MPs from the early sixties. As such, the postbags of Powell, and those of Ramsey and Huddleston analysed below, cannot be considered anomalies in terms of expressions of white English animosity towards black people. The letters have a history which predates Powell's infamous 1968 speech. The letters prove so fruitful in understanding how ordinary people understood 'race' and 'immigration' in the sixties because they function 'as a bridge between public and private, giving what were perceived as essentially private worries a public form. Letters gave voice, as putatively private and personal media, to what otherwise was unspeakable in public'.⁶⁴⁶

Powell's public usage of his letters would have shown the later letter writers that they were not alone in their writings.⁶⁴⁷ This probably explains why many of the letters were sent to Huddleston *and* Powell. Importantly too, whereas many of the letters sent to Powell were short letters of agreement, the letters to

⁶⁴⁶ Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, pp. 37–39, 43, 47, quote from p. 37. Lorna Chessum, 'Race and Immigration in the Leicester Local Press 1945–62', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 17 (1998), 36–56.

⁶⁴⁷ Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, p. 37.

Huddleston and Ramsey were often long, rambling, and vicious.⁶⁴⁸ As such the letters show us how the unspeakable racism of the Dummetts' 'crypto-racialists' was made speakable through a closed and private space.⁶⁴⁹ The shame of expression need not be encountered when the recipient of the speech occupied a distant space. In this way, the letters represent a disembodied voice which the speaker would never be held accountable for. Each of these letters symbolised a disruption to the public myth of tolerance, a freedom to truth-telling engendered by the enclosed and safe space of the envelope, and the anonymity of a postcard's scrawl.

Selected for analysis below are the themes which predominated across the letters generally; but also in some instances of particular interest, the theme or trope may only have appeared abundantly in one batch. The themes selected for discussion are: transference of racism to others and constructions of vulnerability; constructions of proximity and distance; fears over, and resistance to, integration; Empire, colonialism, slavery, and reparations; and 'invasion' and allusions to war.⁶⁵⁰ This is not to suggest that there are no other aspects to the letters. For instance, one could also approach the letters through the preponderance of racist tropes in the earlier letters versus the reliance on discourses around scarcity of resources in the latter.⁶⁵¹ Also of note, particularly

648 This observation is based on the letters to Powell in the following files: Enoch Powell Archives (EPA), D3123/1, D3123/7, D3123/32, and D3123/67.

649 Dummett and Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', pp. 25–78. See the Introduction for more on this.

650 These themes are somewhat similar to those that Bill Schwarz pulls out of the Powell postbag: erosion of national identity, war and invasion, the failures of integration on the part of black people, proximity/distance, repatriation, miscegenation, legislation, and gratitude to Powell. The latter was a major theme in the postbags analysed here but is not discussed. Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, pp. 41–43, 45, 47, 49.

651 The tropes had four main areas: dirt and disease, sexual misconduct, crime, and generalised personality and/or conduct failures. The resources were housing, education, welfare, and jobs. Whilst *at first glance* the resource aspect might almost seem like rational fears rooted, as many have claimed, not in 'race' but in numbers, this soon comes undone upon further analysis since the scarcity is constructed through the racialisation of immigration. In respect of this, one possible reason for the shift away from a more vicious and direct form of racism was the Race Relations Act 1965. This vigorously resented Act most likely resulted in the construction of a form of racist discourse which attempted to mask itself in various ways. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 31–33, 40–47, 94–100, 104–105. Ramsey 130, ff. 15, 28, 32–34, 104–105, 123–126, 170–173. THP, 39, Letter from Halifax, West Yorks, 14 October 1969. Racial Preservation Society Pamphlet, 18 September 1966. Anonymous 'England My England' Poem, n.d., c. 1968–9. Letter from Harrow, 14 June 1969. Letter from Leicester, 31 October 1969. Letter from London, W5, 12 October 1969. Letter from Wolverhampton, n.d., c. 1968–9. Letter from Shoreham by Sea, Sussex, 13 October 1969. Letter from Birmingham, n.d., c. 1968–9. Letter from Smethwick, Staffs., 13 October 1969. Letter from Slough, Berks., 14 October 1969. Letter from Stepney, n.d., c. 1968–9. THP, 329, Letter from Addiscombe, Croydon, 16 December 1968. Letter from

in light of the outcome of the 2016 EU Referendum, are the persistent calls for a referendum on black migration. Here the writers were assured of the nation voting not only to end immigration (80-90% of the nation agreed with them, so they said) but also of the subsequent repatriation of black people.⁶⁵² Much like the prohibition on EU nationals voting in the 2016 Referendum, they declared that only whites should be allowed to vote, since black people were not, and would not ever be, British or English. One sarcastically declared, and with unintended irony, 'We are all ignorant misguided Fascists and Racialists but are in a very definite majority, that is why the present Government does not hold a Referendum to decide the wishes of the population'.⁶⁵³

By analysing these letters, we can further understand several aspects of racialised discourse in the sixties as it pertained to Christians and to England more generally. Firstly, reviewing these letters assists the reader in understanding what forms racism took in the mid- to late-sixties, and therefore aids in contextualising the stands against it that Christians took at this time. Secondly, the vehemence of the positions taken by the letter writers shows the futility of a liberal 'race relations' focus which, as was stated earlier, did not fully take racism into account nor address it head on. One final aspect should also be noted: whilst both Huddleston and Ramsey were speaking as Christians when they made their interventions into racialised debates, they were not necessarily speaking specifically to Christians. At this time, leading (and learned) Christian figures such as they were, were considered generic voices of

Coventry, 21 November 1968. Letter from Isle of Wight, 21 November 1968. See the following for discussions by sociologists of the sixties in respect of scarcity of resources: Patterson, *Dark Strangers*. Wickenden, *Colour in Britain*. Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*. See also the various works cited in Sivanandan's registers, e.g.: Ambalavaner Sivanandan, *Coloured Immigrants in Britain: A Select Bibliography* (London: Institute of Race Relations, 1969). The government's 1965 White Paper also underscored this: *Immigration from the Commonwealth*, Cmnd. 2739. For the shift in discourse see: Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred', p. 275. Davis, 'Containing Racism?', p. 138.

652 Calls for repatriation were also made after the 1919 racist riots in Glasgow, South Shields, Liverpool, Cardiff, and Barry. By 1921, around twelve hundred people of colour had taken up offers of voluntary repatriation by the government. See: Thompson and Kowalsky, 'Social Life and Cultural Representation', pp. 280–281.

653 THP, 39, Letter from Emsworth, Hants., 13 June 1969. Letter from East Grinstead, West Sussex, 13 June 1969. Letter from Folkstone, Kent, 13 October 1969. Letter from Middlesborough, North Yorks., n.d., c. 1968–9. Letter from London, W5, 12 October 1969. Letter from Cheam, Surrey, 16 October 1969. Letter from London, SW15, 14 October 1969. Letter from London, N14, 12 June 1969. Letter from Newport, 13 June 1969. Letter from London, SW6, 3 November 1969. THP, 329, Letter from London, W1, 21 November 1968. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 29–30, 57–58, 92–93, 110–113, 183–185, 213–215. Ramsey 130, ff. 7, 294.

authority to be heeded by the wider British or English public, not just the closed community of Christian adherents. In this way, it is difficult to say if all of the writers identified as Christian, for many did not mention their religious identification or lack thereof in their letters. However, of those who did mention it, some were definitely practising Christians, whereas others talked of an active rejection of the church because of the stances of Huddleston and Ramsey in respect of black migration and 'race relations'. Either way, whatever the identification of the letter writers, their missives do reflect the views of an active audience of leading Christian figures.

Postbag Themes: Transference of Racism and Constructions of Vulnerability

These are major themes throughout the letters and related in that they sought to transpose aspects of the debate either *away* from the letter writer as an individual (or white people more generally) as originators of racism or prejudice, or *towards* the writer (or whites more generally) as being recipients of racism, prejudice, hardship, and suffering. In particular, Trevor Huddleston was subject to repeated accusations of racism or prejudice (as were black people) which was presumably because of his much stronger stance in comparison to Archbishop Ramsey. Although speaking in and about the twenty-first century and primarily about institutions, Sara Ahmed notes how those who speak about racism become the cause of the problem. Ahmed also states that accusations of institutional racism are often seen as a blow to the organisation's pride and that those who bring institutional racism up are labelled as the *cause* of the injury, rather than the ones who are suffering, or the ones speaking about suffering. Similarly, she states that speaking about racism is seen to hurt the organisation and those who identify with it; as such, the initial charge of racism morphs into being about *their* hurt, rather than an address of the racism originally brought up.⁶⁵⁴ If we can think of the nation in an institutional sense, then Ahmed's insights are as relevant to the sixties as they are today. Additionally, it is possible to see in these transferences a form of denial: it is not 'us' or the nation who are racists, it is you who are bringing it to light. In this way, as Teun van Dijk has observed, these denials attempted to 'challenge the very legitimacy of anti-racist analysis'.⁶⁵⁵

654 Ahmed, *On Being Included*, pp. 142–153.

655 Teun A. van Dijk, 'Denying Racism: Elite Discourse and Racism', in *Racism and Migration*

The most direct way these denials or transferences took place were in simple accusations that Huddleston was 'stirring up trouble between the races'. One writer suggested that, were a person to be accused of racism when broaching the subject of immigration controls, then it was likely that, 'racial feeling is engendered, not diminished'. As in, the suggestion that one's comments might in fact be racist would lead a person to become (more) racist. It is a cyclical logic which was designed to leave the anti-racist with no way to critique the speech of those they opposed. Others claimed that since immigration was 'the gravest, the most insidious and the most calamitous threat to our national survival', it was Huddleston who was dangerous and evil for downplaying its importance, not Powell for drawing the nation's attention to it. Another claimed that the 'problem of immigrants' was a colour problem, not one of 'racialism' which she viewed as somehow different.⁶⁵⁶ As such, she claimed she was shocked that Huddleston had accused Powell of racism and solemnly declared that he had done great damage and upset to black people by calling the situation racist. Finally, another attempted to undermine the charge by claiming that words like 'racialist and evil' had no meaning: they were purely emotive language and as such could mean anything.⁶⁵⁷

As well as being accused of racism, the letter writers also levelled myriad ad hominum attacks at Huddleston. He was a coward, a sadist, a dirty old man, a mangy old idiot, senile, scum of the earth, an imbecile, evil, a blasphemer, unchristian, and a Communist. Fundamentally, the copious letters he received along these lines convey a sense of the writers feeling betrayed by a 'traitorous' Huddleston who had stabbed 'his own people in the back' and who were allegedly suffering because of 'immigration' (as opposed to suffering as a consequence of their racialisation of it). Indeed, by attempting to advocate for people of colour, both Huddleston and Ramsey were considered to have taken the side of black people *against* that of whites. The decision to interpret Ramsey and Huddleston's actions in this way led to accusations that Huddleston in

in Western Europe, ed. by John Wrench and John Solomos (Oxford: Berg, 1993), pp. 179–193 (pp. 180–181, quote from p. 181).

656 One suspects that this separation out of 'race' and colour was due to the impact of the Race Relations Act: one could 'legitimately' denigrate on the basis of colour but not 'race'.

657 THP, 329, Anonymous Letter, 17 December 1968. THP, 39, Letter from Holland, Surrey, 11 October 1969. Letter from Ipswich, 12 October 1969. Letter from Luton, Beds., 15 May 1969. Letter from Halifax, West Yorks., 14 October 1969.

particular was prejudiced against his 'own kith and kin'. Predictably then, Enoch Powell was often constructed as the hero, as someone doing his best to stop the evil of racial clashes which Huddleston was allegedly provoking. It was then Powell who was 'a realist not a racist' and who had (white) Britain's best interests at heart.⁶⁵⁸

As well as Huddleston, the 'real' racists were, according to the letter writers, black people. Not only did black people have their own 'colour bar', but they were allegedly racist towards each other to a much greater degree than anything practised by white people in England. Furthermore, it was claimed that black people made vile, vicious, slanderous, and somewhat traitorous comments against white people who had, apparently, done nothing but help them. It was recommended that the Archbishop venture down to Speakers' Corner for some 'vicious black speech'. Therefore, the letter writers suggested that were black people to be ejected from 'our land', then the 'racist problem' would disappear along with them, as would all other forms of social malaise. Indeed, black people should be banished since 'British people' were apparently sick of being discriminated against.⁶⁵⁹

Post-colonial conflicts were also produced as evidence of black racism and black racial violence. In this way, many of the writers positioned Britain as morally superior to Kenya, Nigeria, Congo, and Angola (etc.), calling Powell's racism 'mild' in comparison to events there, and claimed that Huddleston's point of view would find much more purchase were he to speak out on those conflicts. One writer graphically listed several occurrences of violence across a decolonising Africa and noted that the 'unspeakable abominations' were done not by 'savages' but by 'creatures who have had the benefits of civilisation'. He

658 THP, 39, Letter from Luton, Beds., 15 May 1969. Letter from Reading, Berks., 24 October 1969. Letter from London, W5, 12 October 1969. Letter from London, SW17, 13 October 1969. Letter from Stockport, 13 June 1969. Letter from Slough, Berks., 14 October 1969. Letter from Torquay, Devon, 14 October 1969. Letter from Holland, Surrey, 11 October 1969. Postcard from Warrington, June 1969. Letter from Torquay, Devon, 12 October 1969. Letter from Ipswich, Suffolk, 12 October 1969. Letter from Guildford, Surrey, 13 June 1969. Letter from London, SE6, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from Maidenhead, Berks., 14 June 1969. Letter from Addiscombe, Croydon, 15 October 1969. Letter from Leeds, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from Worcester, 13 October 1969. Letter from Southampton, Hants., 13 June 1969. Letter from Smethwick, 13 October 1969. THP, 329, Letter from Birmingham, 25 November 1968. Anonymous Letter, 17 December 1968. Letter from London, W1, n.d., c. 1968-9. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 170-173.

659 THP, 39, Letter from London, W5, 12 October 1969. Letter from London, SW17, 13 October 1969. Letter from Guildford, Surrey, 13 June 1969. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 2-3, 34, 123-126.

went on to claim that since Britain had opened its doors to the 'same tribe', the same things would happen here. Black people, he claimed, were the sons of Cain who would destroy the English way of life.⁶⁶⁰ As van Dijk has noted, what these writers were displaying was a form of denial of the English variants of violence and racism by way of foregrounding the racism and violence of other people, specifically the other people Huddleston and Ramsey were attempting to protect. This denial served as a mechanism through which they could mask and deny their own dehumanising racism. It was, in this way, a strategic deflection device.⁶⁶¹

Another prevalent theme was the construction of selfhood and nation as implicitly vulnerable somehow.⁶⁶² It is hard to understand how the presence of someone perceived as unlike oneself diminishes oneself, but it is a clear and pronounced theme, and suggests a deep rooted conformity, conservatism, insecurity, and lack of a stable sense of self. This theme is especially prevalent in the later letters, whereby the discourse moved from vicious and often violent tropes into constructions of the victimhood and vulnerability of white Britons in the face of black 'immigration'. It is important to underscore the implicit nature of this theme – at no point did a letter writer explicitly state their feelings of vulnerability – however, by positing oneself or one's nation as beleaguered, oppressed, and in danger of survival, one speaks from a space of perceived weakness and vulnerability.⁶⁶³ These feelings were expressed in three main ways: in an individualised way, in a national way, and in respect of the Race Relation Acts.

To begin with the former, and related to how people were understanding 'integration', there were repeated fears over the literal end, and/or complete marginalisation of, white Britons as a consequence of black 'immigration'. One writer asked why 'freckled, golden haired children' should disappear from Britain because of Huddleston's 'mania'? Others felt that 'immigration' should be

660 THP, 39, Letter from Welling, Bexley, 16 June 1969. Letter from Grays, Essex, 12 October 1969. Letter from Croydon, 17 June 1969. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 49.

661 van Dijk, 'Denying Racism', p. 182.

662 This expression of vulnerability is related to debates over the decline of Britain in relation to modernisation which were common at this time. For discussions of this in relation to 'religion' see the Introduction.

663 Schwarz notes that letter writing itself was 'an activity in which those whites who believed themselves to be victims of racial oppression learnt a public language in which their anxieties could be articulated'. Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, p. 38.

stopped before whites simply became a minority: the very survival of their 'race', culture, and 'religion' was considered to be in jeopardy. Whites were then under siege from (their ideas of) black people who were allegedly hounding them out of their homes and dragging them down by 'disturbing the peace' and 'killing everything decent in Britain'. In this vein, a writer who claimed that she wrote for the 48 other members of a Birmingham 'Over 40's Club' stated that lots of white people were now in mental hospitals because of the activities of black people. Another letter, perhaps authored by one of those hospitalised, claimed that since they were too old to escape black people through emigration, they might as well commit suicide. Similarly, the author of a pamphlet entitled 'Crucified: 15 Years in a Coloured Ghetto' threatened to commit suicide because of black migration.⁶⁶⁴

One writer complained that her regular church-going led to expectations that she be friendly and polite to black people, thereby constructing her piety as a route through to her victimhood. She noted further pressures on her due to her above average ability at concealing her prejudice, thereby seemingly oppressing herself through her own deceit. In a similar manner, many of the letter writers complained of being demoralised and slandered by accusations of racism. They complained of not being able to be patriotic or ask questions out of fear of being branded a racist or a fascist. One sneered, 'How the word "Racialist" is rolled round and round in your unholy mouths – "intellectual" without intelligence, truth or compassion for the white man even in his own country'. Another had created her own dating system: BBC, Before (Mark) Bonham-Carter.⁶⁶⁵ Perceiving charges of racism as a mechanism for shutting down speech is evidence of yet further transference and denial. Rather than speak a truth as they saw it and then enter into an honest debate about how that truth was perceived and heard, the letter writer would rather construct a silencing persecution complex. This complex fed into the discourse of their own oppression which they were developing, and assisted them in avoiding discussions of the ramifications of their own speech and actions on others.

664 THP, 39, Letter from Holland, Surrey, 11 October 1969. Letter from Leicester, 31 October 1969. Letter from London, SW17, 13 October 1969. Crucified: 15 Years in a Coloured Ghetto, n.d., c. 1968-9. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 28-31, 104-105.

665 THP, 39, Letter from Stockport, 13 June 1969. Letter from Britisher, n.d., c. 1968-9. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 40-47, 110-113.

In a national sense, the vulnerability was predominantly expressed through claims over the exploitation of the welfare state in the form of tax-dodging and benefit fraud. White pensioners and working classes were an insecure and beleaguered people who were either unable to get access to the welfare state by way of being denied pensions, or who resented having to share access to what seemed like their birth-right alone. The white working classes had been third class citizens longer than black people had been second class ones, it was said. This understanding of an oppressed class-based self coupled with the erroneous belief that black people had not paid into the system, led to cries of abuse in reference to the idea of black recipients of welfare (or their future pensions). Black British migrants were said to have exploited British goodwill and tolerance: they had harmed, robbed and stolen from Britain in order to get welfare. Indeed, one writer noted that, 'our very tolerance has seemed to be our undoing'. This chimes with van Dijk's observation that tolerance is perceived as only being able to be stretched so far, after which it becomes a 'bad thing' as it could be interpreted as weakness.⁶⁶⁶ By way of advocating the end of any further assistance to black people one writer said, 'In our Lord's Day there were many lepers, but only a few were cleansed'. Another that 'immigration is the gravest, the most insidious and the most calamitous threat to our national survival'.⁶⁶⁷

Predictably the Race Relations Acts of 1965 and 1968 were often referred to as the cause of the oppression of white people.⁶⁶⁸ The Acts were seen as favouring black people and as infringing on the basic rights of white people.⁶⁶⁹ The Acts were seen as a gross insult on whites who 'had let' black people come to Britain and who now had jobs, welfare cheques, and homes at the expense of white workers. In this way, the 'Race Hatred Bill' was perceived as giving black people privileges that whites did not have, and as such, would only cause more suffering. The Acts were undemocratic, discriminated against whites, stopped

⁶⁶⁶ van Dijk, 'Denying Racism', p. 183.

⁶⁶⁷ THP, 39, Letter from Halifax, West Yorks., 14 October 1969. Letter from Worcester, 13 October 1969. Letter from London, SW15, 14 October 1969. Letter from Luton, Beds., 15 May 1969. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 2–3, 76–77.

⁶⁶⁸ As well as the many complaints about this Act, two other writers specifically took umbrage with Tariq Ali's comments that Britain needed black magistrates. One asked, 'Who are these aliens who seek to impose their dominance over the native born white people?' THP, 39, Letter from Wolverhampton, 31 October 1969. Letter from Cornwall, 12 October 1969.

⁶⁶⁹ Conversely, many black people also saw it as designed specifically to curtail black speech. See the references given in n. 558.

white people from speaking out, and placed them in shackles. Finally, one vociferous writer – a Vicar from Yorkshire – even claimed that the Race Relations Act placed Britain in the same space as South Africa as both countries now had racialised laws. He claimed that the Act was insulting to black people as it assumed they were so hated that they needed extra protection. By treating “a man” as “a coloured man”, Britain was therefore diminishing him.⁶⁷⁰

Postbag Themes: Proximity / Distance

A major theme which occurred throughout the letters was the idea that liberal white elites could afford to take the position they did because of their personal and *physical* remoteness from the situation. In essence, this theme represented members of the general public calling out elites on their assumed shared racism, for the root of their protestations lay in the assertion that elites would share their hatred of black people were they to be neighbours in a literal sense.⁶⁷¹ Whilst a very small amount of the letters referred to work or employment situations, overwhelmingly the writers were referencing a *personal* proximity in terms of housing and interpersonal relationships.⁶⁷² Although a minority of writers used the trope of illicit benefit claiming and suggested that black people should be housed by Ramsey or Huddleston in order to take the burden off the taxpayer, the vast majority used tropes about the ways in which black people were alleged to live and then constructed themselves as victims in terms of the impossibility of living in proximity to 'squalor', 'noise', or other 'failures' of behaviour. One writer, who claimed to have 'lived with them since they invaded', stated that white neighbours won't even look at black people, let alone invite them to dinner. He went on to incredulously ask the Archbishop if he would invite a black person to dinner himself, thus underscoring the visceral aspect of the racism as expressed in this form.⁶⁷³

670 THP, 39, Letter from East Grinstead, Sussex, 13 June 1969. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 2–3, 15, 104–105, 222–227, 230–231, 238–239. Bill Schwarz also notes that letter writers to Powell saw the act in the same light. Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, p. 49.

671 Letters to this effect were also sent to newspapers like *West London Observer* and *Marylebone Mercury*. Davis, 'Containing Racism?', p. 139.

672 'Would your Lordship be so keen on coloured immigration if, in the event of serious unemployment, your Lordship had to compete for employment, with these coloured immigrants?' Since interpersonal relations is tied to how the writers understood the concept of integration, that aspect will be dealt with in that section. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 209.

673 LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 31–33, 52, 70, 104–105. Ramsey 130, ff. 7, 15, 32, 34, 119, 168, 170, 184. THP, 39, Letter from Lancashire, 18 June 1969. Letter from Harrow, 14 June 1969.

On 6 March 1968, an article appeared in the *Daily Express* which suggested that a solution to Lambeth's housing problem would be to utilise the grounds of Lambeth Palace. Dripping with sarcasm the writer asked, 'am I being horrid in expecting Dr. Ramsey to carry out his own principles and, with a glad, Christian heart, to undergo some of the trials which he expects, as a matter of routine, from ordinary people?'.⁶⁷⁴ The next day, a postcard addressed to the Archbishop's wife was delivered to Lambeth Palace claiming that on 11 March, a party of seven women and thirty four children would be arriving at the Palace with their bedrolls and clothing. The postcard thanked Mrs Ramsey for her presumed hospitality as they had been in temporary accommodation since arriving in Britain ten days earlier. After an investigation, the postcard was eventually found to have been sent by white people in London, N14 who objected to black people moving in next-door to them.⁶⁷⁵

The postcard was immediately reported to the police in Canterbury, Kensington, and also Special Branch in Scotland Yard which seems like an enormous overreaction based on the content.⁶⁷⁶ Even if the hoax aspect was not apparent at the time of receipt, given that it contained no threats against lives, the reaction to it does serve to point to the truth of the letter writers accusations: elites were afforded their liberalism by virtue of their distance. This is not to give countenance to the racism expressed by those with (alleged) experiences of proximity, but rather to underscore the fragility of elite liberalism: it breaks down upon even the suggestion of a closure of distance.

Postbag Themes: Integration and Segregation

Raymond Williams stated that, 'Culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language'.⁶⁷⁷ On the basis of how the word was used in the sixties, integration could surely make a credible claim to being the second or third. Sociologists of the period noted that the word had at least

Letter from Kings Lynn, Norfolk, 13 June 1968. Letter from Derby, 14 October 1969. Letter from Southampton, 21 October 1969. Letter from London, SW17, 13 October 1969. Letter from Torquay, Devon, 14 October 1969. Letter from Southend, Essex, 14 October 1969.

See also, Whipple, 'Revisiting the "Rivers of Blood" Controversy', pp. 728–729.

674 LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 157.

675 The *Daily Express* article was also referenced by another letter which stated that Pitman's idea was fabulous and that Ramsey should fill his grounds with 'the immigrants he loves'. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 180, 183.

676 LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 178–179, 191.

677 Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (London: Fontana, 1976, repr. 1988), p. 87.

three meanings: assimilation, the opposite of segregation, or a type of pluralism with the connotation of parts fitting into a whole.⁶⁷⁸ In respect of these multiple meanings, Revd Dai Kitagawa of the World Council of Churches (WCC) noted how few people, social scientists and otherwise, understood what was meant by the term integration nor how to achieve it. Kitagawa defined integration implicitly by saying that it was the task of the church 'to help recreate a new situation in which the indigenous population and the overseas people are so woven together as to become a new society'. He also asserted that the 'native' needed more help in adjusting to the new situation since the newcomers were already on the way to changing themselves by virtue of their move. He stated that, 'The immigrants want a new life while the natives want to remain unchanged. The latter resent the former because their coming compiles them to change, which is the last thing they want to do'.⁶⁷⁹

Alongside the above three definitions, there was also a fourth understanding of the concept of integration held by some black people, especially by the end of the decade. For instance, Roy Sawh noted that 'The English did not integrate with Africans when they went to Anzania and changed it to South Africa'; as such, he asserted that integration was merely 'a subterfuge for maintaining white supremacy'.⁶⁸⁰ Similarly, a black American Baptist, Nathan Hare, who was present at the 1969 WCC Notting Hill Consultation which is discussed in Chapter Six stated the following:

It will be an irony of recorded history that 'integration' was used in the second half of this century to hold the black race down, just as 'segregation' was so instituted in the first half. 'Integration', particularly in the token way in which it has been practiced up to now, and the neo-tokenist manner now emerging, elevates individual members of the group but, paradoxically, in plucking many of the strongest members from the group while failing to alter the lot of the group as a whole, weakens the collective thrust which group might otherwise muster.⁶⁸¹

678 Rose, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship*, pp. 24–25. See also, John Vincent, *The Race Race* (London: SCM Press, 1970), pp. 15, 37–38, 57–59. See the following for a discussion on the language of assimilation, integration, and cultural pluralism as used by the Church of England: Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 323–344.

679 WCC, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective*, pp. 9–10, quotes from p. 9, emphasis his.

680 Roy Sawh, cited in, Vincent, *The Race Race*, p. 38. Roy Sawh, *From Where I Stand* (London: Hansib, 1987), p. 83.

681 WCC, 4223.1.02, The Struggle to Eradicate Racism, and the New American Dilemma by Nathan Hare, World Council of Churches Consultation on Racism, No. 4/E, 19-24 May 1969.

With these kinds of comments, we find a clear suspicion over the rhetoric of integration and with good reason. However, these four understandings of integration – white supremacy, assimilation, the opposite of segregation, and pluralism – were not utilised in the letters to Ramsey and Huddleston. In these letters, a fifth definition emerged.

On the basis of these letters, it is abundantly clear that a large amount of ordinary white people in fact understood something quite different by integration: *miscegenation*.⁶⁸² It would be difficult to overstate the vehemence with which many of the letter writers resisted integration understood as such. Integration was impossible, it was abhorrent, it was the work of the devil and the devil must be ousted from England. The idea of it evoked dread, distress, misery, and fear. Others claimed that history showed that integration did not work, and others still that not only would *they* never integrate, but their grandchildren would be taught the same. 'Even animals in the jungle stick to their own species for breeding purposes', said one. This understanding of integration was also why a referendum on immigration and repatriation was considered to be so urgent: for these writers, the only meaningful form of integration was intermarriage, which they believed would mean England becoming a predominantly black nation. In its replies, rather than contesting the substance of the writers' objections and challenging the idea that there was anything wrong with 'mixed marriages' or that there were even distinct 'races' which could intermarry, the Archbishop's office instead weakly replied that integration did not mean 'mixed marriages', but rather the facilitation of happy employment situations.⁶⁸³

'Mixed marriages' were, for these writers, emphatically and utterly wrong, and the writers asserted that people whom they wouldn't permit their kids to marry, shouldn't be allowed to live amongst them. The primary reason for such vociferous rejection was due to the children produced by such unions. Each of these letter writers were absolutely convinced of the existence of 'race' and as such, did not want to replace the 'white race' with a 'coffee coloured' one. The

682 See also the National Front's cries of 'integration means miscegenation' during the 1969 WCC Consultation discussed in Chapter Six.

683 THP, 39, Letter from Brighton, 15 June 1969. Letter from Wallington, Surrey, 18 October 1969. Letter from Stockbridge, Hants., 18 October 1969. Letter from Bath, 14 June 1969. Letter from Maidenhead, Berks., 14 June 1969. THP, 329, Letter from Swindon, 23 November 1968. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 52, 57–58, 87, 92–93, 103–105, 183–185.

Archbishop in particular, alongside NCCI, was repeatedly accused of wanting to 'mongrelise' the white race, which would mean the annihilation of the alleged 'white genius' presumably evidenced in Empire. Illustrating Cold War fears, integration as miscegenation was also claimed to be either Marxist or Communist in origins. It was alleged that the Communists wanted to destroy the white races through miscegenation as it was 'easier to manipulate a mongrel than a thorough-bred'. As such, 'communists and a certain type of Jew' were working to 'destroy the white races, and particular [sic] the British, because these are an obstacle to their "1984" type of world Government'.⁶⁸⁴

Whilst it was often put crudely – 'the tragedy of half-caste kids' – it is important to remember that rejection of 'mixed marriages' and 'inter-racial sex' spanned all classes.⁶⁸⁵ For instance, Eva Reading who had been chair of the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council (CIAC) wrote to the Archbishop stating that the 'illegitimate black children of white mothers' needed to be sent back to their 'country of origin'. Whilst, she admitted, this was very difficult since they were actually 'born in Britain' (but clearly not British), she nevertheless continued to say that, 'surely they would have a far happier childhood among their own people'. Her reasoning in wishing to send the children outwith the borders of England to a people and place which they had never known was that, since no one would adopt them here, they would end up in care and children that stayed in institutional care usually ended up as delinquents.⁶⁸⁶ This shows an utter rejection of the possibility of black Englishness (or Black Britishness) and also that racism as paternalism was clearly still evident in the elites of 1965.

One final aspect should be noted in respect of integration as miscegenation. Whilst 'inter-racial' sex was obviously implicit in the fears over 'coffee coloured' children, at no point did the writers address this explicitly. It is, of course, the elephant in the room but it is significant that aside from one reference of a friendship ruined because of a pass made by a Malaysian male, black men were not cited as being sexually aggressive towards white women, nor black

684 THP, 39, Stockbridge, Hants., 18 October 1969. Letter from Harrow, 14 June 1969. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 57–58, 92–93, 183–185, 223.

685 LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 104–105. THP, 39, Letter from Stockbridge, Hants., 18 October 1969.

686 LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 90–91.

women towards white men, by either the female or the male writers.⁶⁸⁷ When the alleged licentiousness of black people was complained of, it appeared more as a moral condemnation about a self-contained and external community, rather than as something which affected the letter writers in a personal way.

Postbag Themes: Empire, Colonialism, Slavery, and Reparations

Most black people, and progressive whites acting solidarity in with them, tended to locate the black British experience in colonialism and Empire and argued, almost without exception, from an internationalist perspective.⁶⁸⁸ Indeed, Sivanandan's aphorism 'we are here because you were there' is, in some ways, all that needs to be said on this. As Paul Gilroy has noted, black people – now and then – tended to see themselves as part of a diaspora of international networks.⁶⁸⁹ This can be seen throughout the decade in statements made by black people. For instance, an editorial by Claudia Jones in the *West Indian Gazette* in 1960 stated,

Ours has been a partisan but not a narrow fight. We are aware in this modern world where satellites can be recovered from outer space that there is an inter-relationship between the struggle for freedom and human dignity everywhere; hence the reflection in our columns of freedom struggles, be they in Cuba or in the Congo, in Laos or in British Guiana, in Cyprus or in Mali; or in the sitdowns of Negro students in Atlanta, Georgia.⁶⁹⁰

At the other end of the decade, Wilfred Wood observed the failures of liberal whites to understand the feelings of black people *around the world*. He made reference to the humiliations experienced when listening to white liberals take 'anti-racist' stances based on *numbers* of black people, rather than the erosion of the dignity of black people as *human beings*.⁶⁹¹ He further pointed out how the unjust treatment of black people in England was linked to South African apartheid, the American south, Rhodesia, and the exploitation of the colonies in

687 LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 40–47.

688 See also, Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, pp. 180–187. Gardiner, *A World of Peoples*, p. 9.

689 Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black*, pp. 202–209.

690 'We are Three! - An Editorial', *West Indian Gazette*, Vol 3, No. 2, Sept 1960, pp. 1, 4, quote from p. 1.

691 Wood was writing to Trevor Huddleston thanking him for being an exception to this rule. THP, 329, Letter from Wilfred Wood to Trevor Huddleston, 24 November 1968. Dignity was a recurring theme for many black and white anti-racist activists. See also: Ramamurthy, *Black Star*, p. 16.

general.⁶⁹² Indeed, whether it was in small community-based periodicals like *The Black Ram*, in chapters in mainstream published texts such as Roy Sawh's essay on 'Black Power in Britain', in letters to Trevor Huddleston, speeches made by David Pitt, or the writings of James Baldwin, international solidarity and the history of colonialism and Empire rooted and sustained the speech of black activists throughout the decade.⁶⁹³ In this way Bill Schwarz is right to observe that, 'the migrant experience gave *that* past – the history of slavery and colonialism – a new salience in *this* present – the moment of decolonization itself'.⁶⁹⁴

As was shown in Chapter One, Trevor Huddleston argued repeatedly from an internationalist perspective.⁶⁹⁵ In response to his letters and public speeches, Huddleston, alongside all of the racist condemnations, received some supportive letters from white members of the public who also rooted their politics internationally and in the context of British colonialism.⁶⁹⁶ However, it is clear that this was a minority position amongst white people at that time. To wit, Jodi Burkett notes that the National Union of Students (NUS) voted in a new internationalist policy to take strong action against any discrimination on 'race, religion, class or political beliefs' in April 1958. However, she further notes that by the late sixties, the general feeling in organisations like the NUS and the

692 Wood and Downing, *Vicious Circle*, pp. 19, 31–33.

693 *The Black Ram*, Vol 1, No. 4, 15 March 1969. *The Black Ram*, Vol 1, No. 5, 15 April 1969. Sawh, 'Black Power in Britain', pp. 123–139. THP, 39, Letter from London, SW11, 14 October 1969. See Chapter Four for speeches made by David Pitt. James Baldwin has said: 'History, as nearly no one seems to know, is not merely something to be read. And it does not refer merely, or even principally, to the past. On the contrary, the great force of history comes from the fact that we carry it within us, are unconsciously controlled by it in many ways, and history is literally *present* in all that we do'. James Baldwin, 'White Man's Guilt', *Ebony*, (August 1965), *emphasis his*. See also the following for a study of James Baldwin's engagement with the British colonial past: Waters, "'Britain is no longer white'". For more on black internationalism see also: Waters, 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness. Wild, "'Black was the colour of our fight.'"'. Myers and Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education', pp. 517–518. John, 'The Black Experience of Britain', pp. 11–17. And of course the numerous writings by Ambalavaner Sivanandan such as, 'From Resistance to Rebellion; and 'RAT and the Degradation of Black Struggle', in *Communities of Resistance: Writings on Black Struggles for Socialism*, by Ambalavaner Sivanandan (London: Verso, 1990), pp. 77–122.

694 Bill Schwarz, 'Not Even Past Yet', *History Workshop Journal*, 57 (2004), 101–115 (p. 111), *emphasis his*.

695 As did Revd Kenneth Leech in his *Struggle in Babylon*, p. 63. Kenneth Leech was another Christian involved in anti-racist work from his Oxford Student days. See Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, pp. 105–106.

696 THP, 39, Letter from SW13, 17 June 1969. THP, 329, Copy of Letter from Sheffield, 9 January 1969. Letter from Sompting, Sussex, 22 November 1968. Letter from Pembroke College, Oxford, 1 June 1969. See also Revd John Downing's essay on this, 'But That's History!', in *Justice First*, ed. By Donnelly, pp. 10–24.

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was that (white) Britain was insular and utterly disinterested in world affairs.⁶⁹⁷ This section will therefore seek to understand how the letter writers understood the past in respect of colonialism, Empire, slavery, and reparations.

Empire and colonialism were major themes for these letter writers. The vast majority were writing to Huddleston, reflecting his emphases in the 'Education and Human Rights' speech. To remind the reader, here Huddleston made critical references to Britain's colonial past including stating that slavery gave African and Caribbean people a special claim on British society.⁶⁹⁸ Paul Gilroy has written that once Empire became a source of shame, remembrance of this history was diminished and this therefore resulted in 'the error of imagining that postcolonial people are only unwanted alien intruders without any substantive historical, political, or cultural connections to the collective life of their fellow subjects'.⁶⁹⁹ In contrast to this, what we find below, as indeed Lorna Chessum found in her analysis of letters to the Leicester local press, was a strong awareness of this history coupled with a refusal to accept that this history had the same implications that Huddleston and Gilroy, amongst many, many others would expect.⁷⁰⁰ Memories of Empire come through in these letters in various ways: Empire as inherently good and/or positive, resentment over the end of Empire, and the rejection of any responsibility of the legacy of Empire due to its location in a distant past.⁷⁰¹

Whilst one or two of these particular letter writers did agree that there may have been some downsides to colonial rule, overwhelmingly they were united in agreement that Empire had brought good to the world, above and beyond

697 Burkett, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain*, pp. 159, 170–173. Stephen Tuck also noted the internationalism of student politics in the early 1960s. Tuck, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union*, p. 128. c.f. Camilla Schofield reports how Powell framed immigration as a case of the government putting past imperial and international obligations above the priorities of the working-class. Schofield, *Enoch Powell and the Making of Postcolonial Britain*, p. 19.

698 Huddleston, *Education and Human Rights*, pp. 5–6.

699 Gilroy, *After Empire*, p. 98.

700 In this way, these aspects of the letters are a pronounced example of what Stanley Cohen would call 'implicatory denial'. 'Implicatory denial' is when facts are not denied, but the moral, psychological or political implications that conventionally follow are denied or minimised. Cohen, *States of Denial*, pp. 7–9. Chessum, 'Race and Immigration in the Leicester Local Press 1945-62', pp. 36–56.

701 In some ways, these discrepancies of interpretation could be seen to represent struggles over how Britain 'should package and manage its memory' of Empire. Thompson and Kowalsky, 'Social Life and Cultural Representation', p. 259.

anything else. Indeed, colonialism was primarily seen to have saved people from barbarism and cannibalism, and to have brought hygiene, farming, industry, medicine, roads, peace, and security to people and places. The writers clearly had a Whiggish understanding of the colonial past and were utterly lacking in nuance or attention to experiences and points of view unrelated to elites and/or whites. The writers were fundamentally convinced that British people gave more to the people they colonised than they themselves received, and were therefore unrepentant of Empire. From members of the armed services who claimed that India and Burma showed the 'fine results of British Occupation', to those who stated that Empire brought 'primitive people out of the darkness', it is clear that these writers generally felt that 'The old British Empire was magnificent, for we ruled as conquerors'.⁷⁰²

What these assertions also reflected was an underlying anger and resentment over any suggestion that Empire may have been anything other than good. By refusing to consider (or by mentioning only in passing, infrequently, and without detail) the negative aspects of Empire, the writers were rejecting the bad and, more importantly, engaging in a form of denial that there was any to speak of in the first place. This links into a further resentment over the end of Empire itself. This anger and resentment is linked to a clear feeling of being 'kicked out of' the countries Britain had formerly ruled, so the problem was about a forced relinquishing of something felt to be their own. The writers clearly resented that black people had fought for their independence, and used this to complain that Britain should not now 'be forced to accept them' within the boundaries of the island. For the letter writers, independence meant that black people had no further claims or rights to Britain and they repeatedly stated that black people should take the millions in aid given to their countries and stay there to develop them. Similarly, others constructed Empire as a burden they were relieved to be rid of. This resentment over the forced ending of colonial rule shows that the

702 THP, 39, Letter from Ipswich, Suffolk, 13 October 1969. Letter from Kingston, Surrey, 14 October 1969. Letter from London, N16, 18 October 1969. Letter from Holland, Surrey, 11 October 1969. Letter from Stockbridge, Hants., 18 October 1969. Letter from Bath, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from Kingston-Upon-Thames, Surrey, 12 June 1969. Letter from Bexley, Kent, 15 June 1969. Letter from Luton, Beds., 15 May 1969. THP, 329, Letter from Sevenoaks, Kent, 21 November 1968. Letter from Dorchester, Oxon., 25 November 1968. Letter from Kingsbridge, Devon, 29 May 1969. Letter from London, W1, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from Pulborough, Sussex, 21 November 1968. Letter from Swindon, Wilts., 23 November 1968. Letter from London, SW10, 24 November 1968. Letter from Southampton, 22 November 1968. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 183-185.

writers had a view of Empire and colonialism diametrically opposed to that of Huddleston and those who had experienced it in a personal sense as subjects. Just as some writers constructed the notion that Britain – or their 'birthright' – could no longer be considered theirs because of black British migration, so too was Empire their 'birthright'. This feeling was demonstrated by their anger over its loss and the belief that black people seized every opportunity for humiliating and molesting white people in the process of wresting their land back from Britain. Indeed, if Africa was to be for the Africans, then Britain was to be for the (white) British.⁷⁰³

Just as black people repeatedly disrupted temporality in respect of slavery since they still suffered its consequences, so too we find whites disrupting temporality in a different way: by positing Empire and slavery in a distant past. Empire was a hundred years ago, a hundred and fifty years ago, over two centuries ago. It was long dead, very old, and something the letter writers' ancestors did.⁷⁰⁴

Given the proximity to Empire and colonialism and the lived processes of decolonisation occurring during the sixties, this construction of a distant Empire is noteworthy, and again illustrates a profound form of denial of events as they occurred. Given the above noted clearly expressed sentiments, one also presumes that it was constructed in this fashion out of a bitterness and resentment over the loss of Empire, as well as a refusal to accept responsibility for the legacies of Empire, owing to the shift in comfort levels that the relinquishing of white privilege would entail.

Michel de Certeau has talked of how the past repeatedly bites the present; he therefore called history cannibalistic and posited memory as a site of conflict between an act of forgetting the past and the return of a past which is forced to disguise itself. The past, he said, infiltrated the present, it resurfaced and

703 THP, 39, Letter from Stockbridge, Hants., 18 October 1969. Letter from Addiscombe, Croydon, 15 October 1969. Letter from Slough, Berks., 14 October 1969. Letter from Croydon, Surrey, 17 June 1969. Letter from Holland, Surrey, 11 October 1969. Letter from Luton, Beds., 15 May 1969. Anonymous Letter, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from Gillingham, Kent, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from Christchurch Cathedral, Dorset, 11 June 1969. Letter from Newport, 14 October 1969. Letter from Clackton-on-Sea, Essex, n.d., c. 1968-9. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 183–185. Ramsey 130, ff. 32–34. See also, Whipple, 'Revisiting the "Rivers of Blood" Controversy', p. 732.

704 THP, 39, Letter from Halifax, West Yorks., 14 October 1969. Letter from Kingston, Surrey, 14 October 1969. Letter from Addiscombe, Croydon, 15 Oct 1969. Letter from Wilmslow, Cheshire, 12 October 1969. THP, 329, Letter from London, SW7, 28 November 1968. Letter from Pangbourne, Berks., 21 November 1968.

disturbed with resistances and residues over and against the objections of the social body.⁷⁰⁵ Using de Certeau's language, we can see the tensions between the bodies of people who were repeatedly bitten by the past – the collectivity of a people for whom colonialism and slavery were direct and/or historical *personal* experiences and who therefore sought to leave the mark of their experience on the English social body – and of the bodies of people who bit and who resisted any historical interpretations of that bite. Tellingly, one writer raised concerns over Africans writing their own histories of colonialism: she considered this to be Orwellian double-think and newspeak.⁷⁰⁶ In this refusal to allow the subaltern to speak, we see a direct refusal to be bitten back. A denial of the presence of an alternate history in the contemporary social body.

Thinking back to the section on 'proximity and distance' above, we also find the letter writers constructing themselves, or the working-class more generally, as blameless and the elites as the perpetrators. The poor and underprivileged of the country were not the ones to benefit from the slave trade and colonialism, it was the wealthy and those who occupied seats of power. Nevertheless, it was the poor who suffered because of elite guilt and through precious social resources being given to black people. Indeed, apparently angry at everyone in England, one prolific writer from Addiscombe blamed the parasitical royal family – 'the Greco-German polo playing clot' – for claiming the former colonies for themselves, and for taxing the poor to support their lifestyles, as well as the lifestyles of black migrants.⁷⁰⁷ It is noteworthy that the writer would choose to use a racialised slur against an institution itself based on premises so similar to that of racism: that one group of humans are superior to others.

In respect of discussions of slavery and reparations, most letter writers were directing themselves to Trevor Huddleston in response to his letter in *The Times* on 21 November 1968. Here he stated that Britain had a debt to pay because of slavery and that it was time to turn to the task of reparations.⁷⁰⁸ Although there

705 Michel de Certeau, 'Psychoanalysis and its History', in Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1989, repr. 2000), pp. 3–16 (pp. 3–4).

706 THP, 39, Letter from Wilmslow, Cheshire, 12 October 1969.

707 THP, 39, Letter from London, N14, 12 June 1969. Letter from Addiscombe, Croydon, 15 Oct 1969. THP, 329, Letter from Isle of Wight, 21 November 1968.

708 Trevor Stepney, 'Not representative', *The Times*, 21 November 1968, p. 11. He also raised this issue in his NUT speech: *Education and Human Rights*, p. 5.

was one letter which claimed that British slavery actually improved peoples' lives since it transferred those who were already slaves to better environments in the Americas, overwhelmingly one gets a sense of implicit acceptance of the indefensibility of slavery by way of attempts to absolve themselves and/or Britain from contemporary culpability. To wit, one writer suggested that to condemn people then because of the 'slavery issue' would presuppose a vengeful God, but God was love and his death on the cross meant that the sins of mankind were forgiven. Certainly for some of the writers, part of the need to absolve the nation of its sins was so that slavery could not be used as a justification for, and legitimation of, black migration.⁷⁰⁹

The writers attempted to absolve themselves and the nation by four main tactics: blaming Africans and Arabs, blaming elites, constructing a vast distance between themselves/the nation and the crime, and insisting that the emphasis be placed on abolition, not slavery. According to these letter writers, African chiefs encouraged Britain to take part in the slave trade, and indeed, the Arabs were still at it, so the nation need not take responsibility for its involvement. As with colonialism in general, the poor and underprivileged of the nation were apparently not the ones to benefit from the slave trade, nor were they supposedly aware of it; therefore they should not be forced to 'pay for it' through black migration. Distance was constructed by stating that slavery was hundreds of years ago, that only a few British people engaged in it, and that most black people were not descendants of slaves. Finally, there were repeated reminders to stop focussing on the evils of slavery, and to remember instead that Britain was also responsible for the abolition of slavery, which was, inevitably, considered the far more noteworthy act. Furthermore, it was alleged that very little money was made from the slave trade, and that which was made from it had long since vanished, meaning that there was no debt to be repaid.⁷¹⁰ These claims quite clearly reflected a general misunderstanding of the complicated

709 THP, 39, Letter from Bath, n.d., c. 1968-9. THP, 329, Letter from Southampton, 22 November 1968. Letter from Dorchester, Oxon., 25 November 1968. Letter from Kingston, Surrey, 4 February 1969.

710 THP, 39, Letter from Bath, n.d., c. 1968-9. Letter from London, N14, 12 June 1969. THP, 329, Letter from Manchester, 24 November 1968. Letter from Swindon, Wilts., 23 November 1968. Letter from Cowplain, Hants, 25 November 1968. Letter from Cardiff, 26 November 1968. Letter from Isle of Wight, 21 November 1968. Letter from London, SW10, 24 November 1968. Letter from Coventry, 21 November 1968. Letter from Godalming, Surrey, 5 December 1968.

and multifarious ways in which the nation, and consequently those living in it, benefited (and continue to benefit) from the legacies of slavery and colonialism.⁷¹¹

Slavery also appeared in another latent fashion: that of references to black people as labour units. This was done in two main ways. One was to claim that the presence of black labour – assumed to be voluntarily cheap – would impinge on automation and the modernisation of the workplace since employers would have no incentive to embrace technology.⁷¹² The other was the defence and justification of black migration made by liberals purely in terms of a need for labour.⁷¹³ Predictably, there were no references to the cultural, personal, spiritual, civilisational, or indeed any other form of benefit to the nation engendered by the presence of black people. It hardly needs stating that black people were not seen to offer these benefits precisely because they were seen as failing to possess any of worth. Just as in the times of slavery, if black people were considered valuable, it was precisely and only because of their capacity to labour, and furthermore, only as labour in the jobs white people did not want. As technology developed and manufacturing moved from the centre to the periphery, black people were no longer needed or wanted and the successive immigration restrictions began.⁷¹⁴

Postbag Themes: Invasion and Allusions to War

Given its publication in 1965, it should be noted that these letter writers were writing in the shadow of Godfrey Elton's racist text about black migration to

711 Catherine Hall, et. al., *Legacies of British Slave-Ownership: Colonial Slavery and the Formation of Victorian Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014). See also: UCL, Legacies of British Slave-ownership <<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (London: University of North Carolina Press, 1944, repr. 1994). E.J. Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire: From 1750 to the Present Day* (London: Penguin, 1968, repr. 1990).

712 THP, 39, Letter from Stepney, n.d., c. 1968-9. THP, 329, Letter from Coventry, 21 November 1968. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 110–113, 183–185. See also: Lord Elton, *The Unarmed Invasion: A Survey of Afro-Asian Immigration* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1965), p. 41.

713 This was especially prevalent in Ramsey's 1965 replies. See for instance, LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 216, 228, 231. But also in letters from liberal 'community relations' workers such as: THP, 39, Letter from Oldham, 14 October 1969.

714 John, 'The Black Experience of Britain', p. 12. Sivanandan has written repeatedly on this issue. See: Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Anatomy of Racism: The British Variant', *Race Today*, 4 (1972), 223–225. And, 'Race, Class and the State'; Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Imperialism and Disorganised Development in the Silicon Age', in *A Different Hunger*, by Sivanandan, pp. 143–161. Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'New Circuits of Imperialism', in *Communities of Resistance*, by Sivanandan, pp. 169–195. One liberal Welsh letter writer rooted the end of slavery in the invention of a cotton picking machine. THP, 329, Letter from Cardiff, 21 November 1968.

Britain called *The Unarmed Invasion*.⁷¹⁵ Furthermore, the language of invasion was used by other politicians such as Cyril Osborne and Powell, not to mention its continued use by far-right fascists like Colin Jordan and in Oswald Mosley's mouthpiece *Action* from at least 1958.⁷¹⁶ The point here is that reference to black migration as an invasion of sorts did not originate in these letters nor with Powell. It was a language older and wider and with fascist precedent. The interpretation of black migration as invasion was linked to desires for repatriation. One of the strangest letters advocating repatriation and legitimising certain forms of racism came from a Jewish academic at the London School of Economics. He had written a letter to *The Telegraph*, a copy of which was sent to Huddleston, stating that it did not follow from Nazi persecution of Jewish people that *all* racism was wrong. He further suggested that had Hitler's 'final solution' been repatriation to Palestine, then the word Nazi would have a very different connotation.⁷¹⁷

Much like with Powell, the postbags of Ramsey and Huddleston are also full of letters making allusions to war, invasion, and the Nazis.⁷¹⁸ Camilla Schofield's insightful book on Powell tells the reader that memories of war, many of which were incorrect, structured the letters of Powell's communicants. She notes that, for Powell, war and allegiance to the crown were important aspects of national identity and that as such, 'war was the ultimate and final assertion of political allegiance – the sacrifice of one's body and soul to the state'. Therefore, given the incorrect belief that black Britons did not participate in the two world wars, they would always 'carry the problem of a failure of allegiance' and were not entitled to receive the benefits of a welfare state.⁷¹⁹

⁷¹⁵ Elton, *The Unarmed Invasion*.

⁷¹⁶ Not only did Colin Jordan write a letter to an MP in 1960 using the term which was later published in *The Times*, but he was even jailed for publishing a pamphlet entitled 'The Coloured Invasion' in 1967. This is an interesting counterpoint to lack of action in respect of Elton's text and highlights the protection that privilege affords. Although, as Gavin Schaffer noted, it was also the inclusion of anti-Semitism which saw Jordan prosecuted. 'Threat to M.P.: Breach of Privilege Ruled', *The Times*, 13 July 1960, p. 6. 'Colin Jordan gaoled for 18 months', *The Times*, 26 January 1967, p. 9. Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred', p. 261. 'What "Action" Says', *Action (incorporating 'Union')*, 10 January 1958, p. 8. 'Powell again urges action on immigration', *The Times*, 18 November 1968, p. 3. *Hansard*, HC Deb 4 June 1964, Vol 695, Cols 1225–6.

⁷¹⁷ THP, 329, Ezra Mishan, 'Letters to the Editor: Our Multi-Racial Society', *Telegraph*, 20 June 1969.

⁷¹⁸ Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, p. 42.

⁷¹⁹ Schofield, *Enoch Powell and the Making of Postcolonial Britain*, pp. 1–9, quotes from p. 5. In fact, one of the positive letters Ramsey received noted this generalised ignorance on the part of white Britons in respect of black participation in the wars, amongst other things, and

Whilst there are a few letters containing references to the 'invasion' causing the loss of national identity and of black people not fighting in the war and therefore undeserving of British resources, these are in the minority in terms of how this theme was used.⁷²⁰ Overwhelmingly the letters in Ramsey's and Huddleston's postbags use invasion quite mundanely as a general metaphor: we find 'the invaders' being told to 'go home' because they constituted a biological danger, didn't belong, were ruining the nation, and 'weren't British' irrespective of what their passports might say. One writer expressing anger at black people and white elites, claimed that an invasion was still an invasion even when it was countenanced by the government and Trade Union leaders.⁷²¹ Aside from its use in a generalised sense, there were two other main ways in which the idea of invasion was used: to suggest that there would be a third world war along colour lines, and to advance a beleaguered point of view.

The presence of black people causing a war was presented *not* as a consequence of black aggression, but as a consequence of white aggression, which is interesting given the simultaneous tendency of the letter writers to construct themselves as victims. Indeed, the idea of black people claiming England as their own was dismissed tellingly by one letter writer. He said,

Mr James Baldwin, the Negro Novelist, recently stated that, "Englishmen must make up their minds to the fact that England now is as much the country of the negroes [sic] as of Englishmen" as if, forsooth, they had conquered us, instead of the other way around.⁷²²

We find threats to 'march to take back the occupied areas of our land' as well as to take back their human rights, rights of preference, social justice, freedom, *and* their general way of life. All of which were constructed as being in jeopardy by the presence of non-white peoples. Another claimed that fighting the Germans twice meant they were not afraid of fighting black people in the slightest. Indeed, it was claimed that white people would fight to the death to

suggested a series of public lectures to address this. LPA, Ramsey 130, ff. 278–279.

720 THP, 39, Postcard from Warrington, June 1969. Letter from Wolverhampton, 13 November 1969. Anonymous Letter, 12 October 1969. Letter dated 17 October 1969. Letter from Ilford, Essex, 15 October 1969. Ramsey 75, ff. 104–105. Ramsey 130, ff. 121.

721 THP, 39, Letter from London, W5, 12 October 1969. Letter from Stockport, 13 June 1969. Letter from Southend, Essex, 14 October 1969. Letter from Maidenhead, Berks., 14 June 1969. Letter from Stepney, n.d., c. 1968–9. Crucified: 15 Years in a Coloured Ghetto, n.d., c. 1968–9. THP, 329, Letter from London, W1, n.d., c. 1968–9. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 92–93, 183–185. Ramsey 130, ff. 30–31.

722 LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 183–185.

prevent a 'foreign invasion'. And finally, both Huddleston and the politicians were to blame for planting the seeds of a third world war along colour lines for their part in supporting the presence of black Britons.⁷²³

Another strong sentiment was one of beleaguerment and fatigue in the face of the perceived 'black invasion'. These letter writers constructed themselves as not yet having fully recovered from the horrors of the second world war, and as such, seemed almost bewildered by feeling forced to live with the consequences of another war which was both already lost *and* currently occurring. These letters are obviously related to the theme of vulnerability discussed above. These letter writers wanted peace after 'winning two dirty and cruel wars' and were dismayed at what they saw as a betrayal of this peace by elites. The misery of WW2 was understandably close for these writers and they used it to evoke the sense that they had now been imperilled by liberal elites and forced to suffer a new type of misery and violence.⁷²⁴ What was the point of the wars – for some writers evoked both WW1 and WW2 – of protecting the nation's borders, if we were to voluntarily allow it to be penetrated by someone else, they asked? Indeed, these writers felt that with the help of the elites, black people were achieving something which even Hitler had not managed.⁷²⁵

The *Horror* of Racism and World War Two

One further aspect of reference to WW2 in respect of racism in Britain needs to be discussed as it highlights a distancing between racism as practised and denied, and racism as acknowledged and opposed. When pointing to the *horror* of racism, commentators invariably rooted it in the holocaust and Nazism. Racism was experienced as a *horror* not because of slavery, not because it facilitated imperialism and capitalist exploitation of black people, but because of

723 THP, 39, Letter from Cheam, Surrey, 13 October 1969. Letter from Hayes, Middx., 14 October 1969. Letter from London, W5, 12 October 1969. Letter from Ipswich, Suffolk, 14 October 1969. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 183–185. Ramsey 130, ff. 220–221, 238–239.

724 Charlie and Mike Phillips talk about white Briton being shell-shocked because of the war. Phillips and Phillips, *Notting Hill in the Sixties*, p. 25.

725 THP, 39, Letter from Orpington, Kent, 14 October 1969. Letter from Addiscombe, Croydon, 15 October 1969. Letter from Brighton, 18 October 1969. Letter from Wallasey, Cheshire, 14 June 1969. Letter from Brighton, 13 October 1969. Letter from Wilmington, Kent, 24 October 1969. Letter from London, SW15, 14 October 1969. Letter from Wallington, Surrey, 18 October 1969. Letter from Chichester, Sussex, 21 October 1969. LPA, Ramsey 75, ff. 40–47, 104–105. Ramsey 130, ff. 238–239, 299–300. One letter writer to Powell even declared that they would have preferred the Nazi's to black British migration since the Germans had a similar culture. EPA, D3123/7, Letter from Kent, 25 April 1968.

Auschwitz and the gas chambers.⁷²⁶ Indeed, the genocide practised by the Nazis was the main cause for the denouncement of 'racial science' as well as critiques of the origins and nature of racism.⁷²⁷ For instance, despite campaigning vigorously against South African apartheid, Trevor Huddleston asserted that World War Two had 'made mankind as a whole conscious of the meaning of racialism'.⁷²⁸ And in the 1965 Reith Lectures, Robert Gardiner stated that 'the horrors of the Nazi concentration camps should impress on us how urgent it is for all of us to learn habits of understanding and tolerance'.⁷²⁹ Finally, as Willem Adolph Visser 't Hooft, the first secretary general of the WCC was to say during the 1969 Notting Hill Consultation,

One of the things that humanity will have to carry round with itself for a long time to come will be the memory of hundreds of thousands [sic] of Jews who died. I think not only Germany but of the outside world, and specially of the American and British people who could have done much more than they did.⁷³⁰

Furthermore, not only was the *horror* of racism rooted in the holocaust, but Gavin Schaffer has also suggested that the incitement section (Section Six) of the 1965 Race Relations Act, may well have been composed out of a desire to protect Jewish, rather than black, people. For instance, whilst the trial of Colin Jordan included incitement to hatred in respect of black people, Schaffer states that the main concern of the prosecutors was his anti-Semitism.⁷³¹ Additionally, Malcolm X's warnings over the dangers of fascist activity to the black people of Smethwick during his February 1965 visit again referenced the gas chambers rather than other racialised atrocities. Joe Street considers Malcolm X's usage of Nazi imagery a strategic tactic which was designed to tap into the fears of WW2 which still held a powerful hold over British minds.⁷³² But as we can see,

726 C.f. Samuel Moyn, *Human Rights and the Uses of History* (London: Verso, 2014). Moyn is specifically talking about a lack of reference to the Holocaust in human rights discourse until the 1970s, but it is worth observing that there was much reference to the Holocaust in other discourses during the 1960s.

727 Tony Kushner, 'Racialization and "White European" Immigration to Britain', in *Racialization*, ed. by Murji and Solomos, pp. 207–225 (p. 207).

728 THP, 370, Religious Faith and Intolerance, 20-22 October, c. 1950-1959, p. 4, emphasis his.

729 Gardiner, *A World of Peoples*, p. 24. Robert Gardiner was the Under-Secretary-General and Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) from 1961 to 1975.

730 'Church's "guilt" on racism: Notting Hill Consultation', *Methodist Recorder*, 22 May 1969, p. 3.

731 Schaffer, 'Legislating against Hatred', pp. 258–261, 271–273. See also, Norman Fowler, 'Grave difficulties of Section Six', *The Times*, 1 September 1969, p. 6.

732 Street, 'Malcolm X', pp. 943–944.

Malcolm X was not alone in his rooting of racism in that experience.

The WCC has also called the Holocaust the greatest crime in history.⁷³³ van der Bent notes that during 1935-45 there was a preoccupation with Nazi racism within the churches, which meant that other racial conflicts hardly received attention. It was naively believed that once National Socialism was defeated, this would signify the defeat of racism in general. Much later, many critics of the WCC's controversial Programme to Combat Racism would refuse to see the WCC's support of revolutionary movements of the racially oppressed in Africa in the same light as those who fought the Nazis: violence was justified in the case of resistance to the Nazis, but not in the case of anti-colonial resistance. In the post-war period, the concerns over National Socialism were replaced with a preoccupation with South African apartheid, thereby still mainly overlooking racism elsewhere in the world. This eventually led to Visser 't Hooft to ask in 1969 if 'The real issue is not whether Christians want inter-racial justice and equality, but whether they are willing to pay the price for it locally'.⁷³⁴

The point here is not to question the validity of referencing the Holocaust in respect of the *horror* of racism. Indeed, one would hope that you could do no other. Rather, it is simply to note that the many millions of Africans who died in the Middle Passage and the many millions more who were enslaved, were not called to mind when racism as a *horror* was discussed by politicians and 'race relations' professionals speaking in this decade.⁷³⁵ For instance, in his 1969 statement on 'race' for UNESCO, the prominent sociologist Michael Banton said,

Doctrines of racial distinction and superiority cast a dark shadow over the history of the world in the first half of the twentieth century. They played an important part in imperialist arrogance. Then they were utilized for political ends within nations, most notoriously in Nazi Germany. Six million Jews were sacrificed to beliefs about race which had no scientific validity.⁷³⁶

Here we firstly have a temporal issue – why only refer to the first half of the

⁷³³ van der Bent, ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements*, p. vi.

⁷³⁴ van der Bent, 'Logs in Our Eyes', pp. 168–170, quote from p. 170.

⁷³⁵ c.f. Jawaharlal Nehru's Bandung Conference comment on the Infinite Tragedy of African slavery being the worst part of human history of the last several hundred years. Jawaharlal Nehru, 'Closing Speeches of Heads of Delegations', in Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, *Asian-African Conference Bulletin*, 10 June 1955, pp. 6–8 (p. 8).

⁷³⁶ Michael Banton, 'Social aspects of the race question', in UNESCO, *Four statements on the race question* (Paris, France: UNESCO, 1969), pp. 17–29, quote from p. 17.

twentieth-century? Secondly, there is also a distinct difference in the weight of the language – imperialist *arrogance* vs. the *sacrifice* of six million Jewish people. As well as side-stepping the *horror* of racism in terms of the longevity of its history, the variety of ways in which it has been practised, and the atrocities inflicted on Africans and African-descended people, the reminders of, and focus on, the Holocaust also served to engender denials of racism in England: a recoil from the *horror* – this is not us, the Nazis are to blame.

Conclusion

The Introduction discussed the myth of tolerance as expounded by liberals operating in the 'race relations' machinery during the sixties and noted the problematisation of the myth by Christians such as Ann and Michael Dummett and the Revd Daisuke Kitagawa. In conjunction with the rejection of this myth by the Dummetts and Kitagawa, the letters analysed above (and indeed those to Powell) show how beneath the surface of narratives of the essential tolerance of England (or Britain) lie another set of discourses. Discourses of resentment and bitterness, of 'vulnerability' and aggression, and of a refusal to see self in the face of 'the other'. When the curtains were drawn and the envelopes were sealed, all pretence to tolerance was dropped. These were private racisms prevented public expression perhaps out of shame or fear of prosecution, but certainly through a commitment to dishonesty. The anonymous racist 'other' pointed to in public became the self and family once at home. They were the expressions of the parochial, of a people who could not allow themselves to identify with 'the other' because of the ground they would have to concede. A ground which, nevertheless, they experienced as being taken from them anyway.

They show then a people not in literal denial of Empire, but a people who had very different interpretations of its meanings and morality than that which was held by black and white anti-racist activists, then and now. The differing uses and interpretations of history was something uncovered in Chapter One, and will be returned to again in the next chapter. The letters also show a people holding to a certain version of history and a people who attempted to construct barriers to prevent the continued flow of history into the present. Perhaps it is true that truth will, in the end, prevail, because the letters also show how the

codification of racism which occurred after the first Race Relations Act, as expressed through the constructions of vulnerability, were also betrayed by some fundamental need to simultaneously reassert self and nation as that which would rise up and fight back against the 'invaders' whom they bestowed with colonial and imperial racist characteristics. These letters also validate the PEP report and its findings of widespread racism, but given that this was but one in a long line of official reports which gave evidence for the existence of English racism, one wonders at what point the weight of the evidence will prove greater than the power of myth.

Chapter Six: The Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre and the World Council of Churches' Consultation on White Racism

The previous chapter discussed English racisms in the sixties by way of an analysis of the postbags of Trevor Huddleston and Archbishop Ramsey. As a counterpoint, this chapter details how, in 1969, the Team Ministry's involvement with the World Council of Churches (WCC) led to them hosting a deeply significant Consultation on White Racism. The site of the Consultation was the second building and organisation operated by the Team Ministry: the Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre. The importance of this chapter lies in how it reflects the radical changes which were to affect the world churches, and certain English Christians, in respect of how they approached racialised issues by the late sixties: namely a shift away from the earlier liberal 'race relations' discourse, to a radical acknowledgement of, and attack on, white racism. Moreover, the WCC and those English Christians in alignment with the ethos it was professing, also made a significant shift from words into action at this time.

The chapter will firstly give some background information on the Ecumenical Centre itself. Aside from the 1969 Consultation, it existed as site for radical and uninhibited engagement with the wider London, British, and international environment. Whilst it would be true to say that the most significant event which occurred at the Centre was the WCC Consultation, it is equally true that the Consultation sat happily within the ethos of the Centre and the Team Ministry. Therefore, this aspect needs to be explored both in terms of the philosophy of the Centre, and in terms of the other activities held there. However, because of how symbolic the 1969 Consultation was, and because of the importance of the outcomes of it, the bulk of the chapter will focus there. Whilst the general themes of the event will be explored broadly – the economics of white racism, Black Power, and reparations – they will also be explored in more detail through four particular events and speeches. These are: the public meeting with Oliver Tambo and Trevor Huddleston which was interrupted by fascists; the emphases of white English elites; the interruption of the Consultation by American Black Power activists; and the funding of the black-led, Notting Hill based, Free University for Black Studies. These events help the reader to see two things in particular. Firstly, the changed global anti-racist climate of the late-sixties which

many radical Christians sought to express solidarity with; and secondly the rejection of this in favour of the familiar, liberal integrationist, myth of tolerance-based 'race relations' paradigm by white English elites, Christians and otherwise.

Applied Ecumenicity

The Ecumenical Centre utilised the site of the Denbigh Road Methodist Church, which was close to the Lancaster Road Church in Notting Hill. The church was brought under the Team Ministry's leadership as of the 1965 Methodist Conference, with the plan, led by Revd Ainger, to turn it into an Ecumenical Centre. It is important to understand what Revd Ainger, and the Team Ministry more generally, meant by ecumenical. Ainger had long been concerned with the idea of 'applied ecumenicity', by which he meant the WCC's ecumenical conversation applied at the parish level. Ainger believed that the ecumenical movement was in danger of becoming atrophied and therefore needed to move out of its conference stage to become the *modus operandi* of local churches. The Team Ministry more generally felt that the divisions and disunity of the churches reflected the divisions and disunity of the world. They compared the state of the churches to the polarisation of countries such as North and South Korea, the division of the world into the 'haves' of the Western world and the 'have nots' of the 'undeveloped countries', as well as the divisions in humanity which racism constructed. In order to stand against these worldly divisions, the ministers felt that it was not enough to speak only of the *spiritual* unity of the church. Rather, the ministers sought a tangible representation in the form of the Ecumenical Centre so that the church's unity could 'be made as visible as apartheid or the Berlin Wall'.⁷³⁷

Out of these core ideas and beliefs about the wider ecumenical project came the Centre itself which the Team Ministry liked to think of 'as being a sort of theological "wind tunnel" through which people pass, and in which their assumptions and ideas are exposed and tested in discussion and by exposure

⁷³⁷ NHMC, Geoffrey J. Ainger, Reflections on the Group Ministry of the East Harlem Protestant Parish, n.d., c. 1958. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1964. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Lent 1965. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1968. Notting Hill Methodist Church Report, 1968. Brian Frost, *The Secular and the Sacred* (Great Yarmouth: Galliard, 1972), p. 22. Duckworth, Interviewed by the author. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 60. Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill', p. 20.

to the convictions of others'.⁷³⁸ It was to be a place where Christians could talk through their most profound beliefs and experiences with their fellow workers, whether they were Christians or not. As such, the Centre was to be ecumenical in the sense of the original meaning of the Greek *oikoumene*: it was to deal with the concerns of the whole world, not just the concerns of the churches.⁷³⁹ The idea of the Centre was then 'planted firmly in the reality of secular life and the life of society', and it was to be a place where the ideas of social ecumenicism – the unity of humanity, irrespective of their 'religion' – could be put into practise in a specific situation in the world.⁷⁴⁰

It was this philosophy of ecumenicism which saw the *Team* Ministry expand, where it could, into a *Group* Ministry. For, as well as the Team Ministry's meetings with church leaders of other denominations, they were also involved with the local Council of Churches, ecumenical house churches, and the local branch of Christian Aid.⁷⁴¹ As with the Notting Hill Social Council (NHSC), the Ecumenical Centre also worked closely with Fr Hubert Richards from the nearby Corpus Christi College, who sat on the Centre's Committee alongside the Bishop of Kensington (Chair), the Group Ministry, and some Anglican priests. As with Mason and the Social Council, it would seem Richards worked closely with Brian Frost and the Ecumenical Centre until the eventual closure of Corpus Christi College by Cardinal Heenan.⁷⁴²

The Centre was then to be used in a variety of ways for a variety of groups. As Brian Frost, the second Programme Director of the Centre put it,

Essentially the task of such an Ecumenical Centre is to be a bridge, to be open to as many community groups, political parties, churches, pressure groups and individuals as possible. This enables a wide diversity of contacts to be established and helps people to meet often freed from their role playing in the community. Because a local person has been invited to take part he shows a readiness to encounter people to whom he may not normally talk at all. Indeed, he may in his community role, be at considerable variance with particular representatives, but in an atmosphere of dialogue he may find his way to relate in a new way even

738 Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 60.

739 LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, *A New Way: Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre Pamphlet*, n.d., c. July 1968. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, p. 60.

740 Frost, *The Secular in the Sacred*, p. 22.

741 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, Lent 1965. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 57–60, quote from p. 57.

742 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955-1975: Interview with Brian Frost, June 2004.

though he would still want to maintain his specific stance in the community at large.⁷⁴³

The Committee members saw this as an innovative and new use for church buildings, and one which would challenge the idea that Christians were not open to talking to others, or to change more generally.⁷⁴⁴ Certainly, there is something refreshing in the last sentence which saw the aims of the Centre being that of offering a space whereby differing and distinct groups could negotiate relationships with others without losing their own integrity and difference. This was not the language of harmonious assimilation-integration which dominated Christian thinking earlier in the sixties. Indeed, Frost recognised that in modern urban life, conflict was inevitable and an open platform was needed for groups to argue and debate their various experiences, and to 'confront each other freed from the community roles with their pressing claims'. Codified within the very *modus operandi* of the Ecumenical Centre was that it must be 'a place of genuine tensions'.⁷⁴⁵ Therefore, rather than shying away from conflict, the Committee of the Ecumenical Centre saw their task in a two-fold way: 'as an initiatory one – taking hold of some difficult issue and getting people to talk about it – and a sustaining one: helping to nourish a group which has been started until it has found its own feet'. Furthermore, as with the Social Council, the Committee was concerned to make sure that the Ecumenical Centre was not seen as a ground for mission: it was above all a place where people from all backgrounds were to feel comfortable that their views and ways of seeing and being were respected.⁷⁴⁶

By considering some of the activities through which the Centre's organisers expressed their philosophy of 'applied ecumenicity', it is possible to see the variety of ways in which the organisers sought to reach out to the world around them. The first consultation held at the Ecumenical Centre was on 'unattached youth' and it involved Paddy McCarthy, the youth worker from the NHSC's Portobello Project, as well as other youth leaders, social workers, clergy, and

743 Frost, *The Secular in the Sacred*, p. 23. The first Programme Director was an American called Don Van Voorhis. However, upon Van Voorhis' return to America in the summer of 1968, Brian Frost took on this role.

744 *Ibid.*, p. 23.

745 LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, *A World of Cities: Report of a Year's Work*, n.d., c. 1969. Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, *Tomorrow's Londoners: Report of a Year's Work*, n.d., c. 1970.

746 Frost, *The Secular in the Sacred*, pp. 23–24, quote from p. 23.

the police. Other themes, courses, and conferences undertaken in the first couple of years were: Church and Society, Planning the City, Mental Health, Care for the Dying, Youth Work, Anglican-Methodist relations, and Christian Education. There was also an Urban Workshop for Theological Students which was an attempt to counterbalance what they saw as the overly academic training of theological students with some real world practise. As such, the students used the Centre as a base for discussion and meals, but lived in various local homes, and were engaged in 'secular jobs' such as road sweeping and factory work for the first week of the month-long course. This workshop ran every summer for at least five years.⁷⁴⁷

As we get closer to the end of the decade, there was a slight shift in emphasis away from vaguely apolitical welfare topics to more political ones. For instance, in 1968 there was a one day seminar called 'The Other 31' which was a consultation on 'race', politics, social service, and the churches in respect of the GLC and the thirty-two London boroughs. This theme of 'race' and 'race relations' was carried on not only through the 1969 WCC Consultation, but also in a debate in June 1969 between Trevor Huddleston and John Hunt MP on 'race relations', and a series of seminars on 'race relations' which ran under the general title of 'Peace and Justice' in 1971. Praful Patel, the Secretary of the parliamentary All-Party Committee on UK Citizenship addressed the first seminar, and the Group Ministry reported that this proved such a success that Patel and Mason were interviewed by Radio London. There were also events on 'violence and community problems on housing estates in Kensington and Chelsea', Communist-Christian dialogue, the secular use of church buildings, and a day-long event on pressure groups which included the Biafra lobby and homosexual law reform.⁷⁴⁸

747 NHMC, *The City of Man: A Workshop in Urban Ministry for Theological Students* Booklet, 22 June – 20 July 1968. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1967. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, August 1972. LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, *A New Way: Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre Pamphlet*, n.d., c. July 1968. Denny, 'New Life in Notting Hill', p. 20. Mason, ed., *News From Notting Hill*, pp. 61–62.

748 This is not an exhaustive list, but a representational selection of events. LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, *A World of Cities: Report of a Year's Work*, n.d., c. 1969. Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, *Tomorrow's Londoners: Report of a Year's Work*, n.d., c. 1970. NHMC, Notting Hill Methodist Church Report, 1968. Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, *Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Brian Frost*, June 2004. Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, February 1971. RBKC, 280.1NOT, *Race Relations: Discussion Between Trevor Huddleston and John Hunt MP*, 17 June 1969. *Violence and Community Problems on*

As well as politics, welfare, and 'religion'-based events, the Ecumenical Centre also supported a variety of artists, something which was designed to show people that they were interested in 'the way out and the poetic'.⁷⁴⁹ For instance, the Centre worked with the poet and artist Carlyle Reedy, who eventually became their Arts Director. Reedy had come to the UK from America in the sixties and she recalled how Notting Hill was very much like the avant garde New York City she had left behind. Reedy was living next door to the Ecumenical Centre when Don Van Voorhis (the Centre's first Programme Director) approached her saying, "you seem to know a lot of interesting people, could you do something here?" In 1968, she and Van Voorhis worked together to set up a programme of events under the banner of the Arts and Community Centre, which included live music of various genres (rock, acoustic, punk, pop, etc.), drama and avant garde theatre groups, poetry readings, and so on. As well as utilising the Ecumenical Centre's space, eventually the bands put to use the basement of the Lancaster Road Church, whereby it became known as the venue 'The Crypt'. The Team Ministry was very excited by this development and saw it as representing a genuine bridge between the church and the many young artists who lived in Notting Hill at that time.⁷⁵⁰

The 1969 World Council of Churches Consultation on White Racism

Of all the conferences, seminars, and events held at the Ecumenical Centre, one stands heads and shoulders above the rest in terms of global and historical significance: the WCC's Consultation on White Racism. Whilst it took place in a small church building in Notting Hill, this Consultation had world-wide

Housing Estates in Kensington and Chelsea, with Donald Chesworth and others, 15 November 1969. The speeches made during the pressure group seminar were eventually collated and published. See: Brian Frost, *The Tactics of Pressure: A Critical Review of Six British Pressure Groups* (London: Galliard, 1975).

749 NHMC, Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955–1975: Interview with Brian Frost, June 2004.

750 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, March 1968. Notting Hill Methodist Church Report, 1968. LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, A New Way: Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre Pamphlet, n.d., c. July 1968. Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, A World of Cities: Report of a Year's Work, n.d., c. 1969. RBKC, 280.1NOT, A New Way: Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, n.d., c. 1968. Eleanor Roberts, 'Daring to be Present: An Interview with Carlyle Reedy', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 25 (2015), 1–12 (pp. 5–6, quote from p. 6). See also the following interview with punk musician Dave Russell: 'The Arts and Community Centre Notting Hill, 1967-1972: An Interview with Dave Russell', Part One <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yKBFbh09sfE>>, Part Two <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9HMsaA79Ns>>, Part Three <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x3VsNsXoRRg>>, Part Four <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mz9RYjKyq9w>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

ramifications which shattered traditional notions of Christian charity and saw many Christians move into a space of oppositional defiance to the destructive forces of white racism and the economic forces which harnessed it. Reading the archives in 2016, a year resonant with the voices of Black Lives Matter and the rise of the Far Right within Europe, one is struck by the pertinence of the voices of the Consultation and the continued relevance of the discussions of 1969. Not only was there ample evidence of the myth of tolerance embedded within the white establishment English positions, but the Consultation was disrupted on separate occasions by both the Far Right and by Black Power representatives. It was a truly fascinating and surprising event which culminated in Christian commitment to reparations and the eventual funding of armed liberation movements in southern Africa and elsewhere.

Even without knowing the eventual outcomes of the event, there is no doubt that Mason and Frost understood the significance of having the Consultation at the Ecumenical Centre from the very beginning of the arrangements. Frost recalls Mason 'bounding into his office' excitedly informing him that the Consultation would be happening at the Ecumenical Centre. Given the extremely limited resources of the Ecumenical Centre, to the point that Frost's salary was not even guaranteed, this proved something of a challenge. However, as with other aspects of the Group Ministry's work, Frost and Mason were determined to ensure it went ahead no matter what.⁷⁵¹ Thinking back to Ainger's articulation of 'social ecumenicity', and Frost's hopes that the Centre would be a place whereby all could safely and securely communicate their point of view, it is clear that the Consultation, as a platform for discussing the destructive divisions in humanity constructed and maintained through racism, was the perfect expression of the Group Ministry's hopes for the Centre.⁷⁵² Moreover, the Consultation can be seen as the site of a final unfurling whereby the Team Ministry provided a space which housed dialogue with the wider world; an act which represented their underlying cosmopolitan and internationalist concerns.

751 Frost, Interviewed by the author. Brian Frost, 'A Small Cog in a Big Anti-Apartheid Wheel: Pauline Webb, David Haslam and End Loans to South Africa (ELTSA)', in Brian Frost, and Stuart Jordan, *Pioneers of Social Passion: London's Cosmopolitan Methodism* (Peterborough: Epworth, 2006), pp. 189–201 (p. 189).

752 LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, *A World of Cities: Report of a Year's Work*, n.d., c. 1969.

The relationship between the Team Ministry and the WCC did not begin and end with the Consultation. As was detailed in the Introduction, the WCC sent the Revd Daisuke Kitagawa to survey the 'race relations' work of the 'British' churches in 1962, and during this visit, Kitagawa met with the Revd David Mason and his LCC ally, Donald Chesworth.⁷⁵³ In his reply to Kitagawa's request for feedback on the draft report, Mason urged Kitagawa to impress upon the British Council of Churches (BCC) the need for a more coordinated ecumenical approach on the subject of 'race relations' as it was of more use than any single church or denomination working in this area on their own. He also noted 'the comparative weakness of the local Churches in [the] area of racial tension in Britain and how much we would welcome any practical suggestion as to the way in which the W.C.C. could lend us assistance'.⁷⁵⁴

It is not clear how much contact was maintained between the WCC and the Team Ministry in the intervening years, but the importance of the work the Team Ministers were engaged in was clearly valued by both the national Methodist Church and the Race Relations Board, as it saw Geoffrey Ainger and David Mason being sent to the 1968 Fourth Assembly of the WCC in Uppsala. Ainger was the official delegate of the British Methodist Church, and David Mason went on behalf of the Race Relations Board at the special request of the WCC for 'an emergency working party on the whole theme of Race'.⁷⁵⁵ By the time planning for the 1969 Consultation was underway, there was again further contact between David Mason and the WCC's Geneva-based organising committee led by Rena Karefa-Smart.⁷⁵⁶

At some point, Karefa-Smart had initiated contact with David Mason for advice and assistance from the British end. However, this direct contact was to prove problematic for Bishop Kenneth Sansbury, the General Secretary of the BCC. He unhappily wrote to the WCC stating that Mason was not on the British

753 DCA, PP2/94, Letter from Daisuke Kitagawa to Donald Chesworth, July 1962. WCC, 4223.0.03, Letter from Donald Chesworth to Daisuke Kitagawa, 17 August 1962.

754 WCC, 4223.0.03, Letter from David Mason to Daisuke Kitagawa, 17 August 1962.

755 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1968. See Chapter One for more on the Uppsala Assembly.

756 Rena Karefa-Smart held the position of Executive Officer, and she was supported by David Gill and Baldwin Sjollema. Sjollema went on to become the first Director of the Programme to Combat Racism. WCC, 4223.1.01, Memorandum from Paul Abrecht to Dr Blake, Staff Arrangements for the Consultation on Racism After January 20, 18 January 1969. WCC, 4223.1.03, Letter from Michael de Vries to John Crawley, 10 March 1969.

Council itself, nor a member of its Standing Committee on Migration, so using him as a way of keeping in touch with the British situation was not acceptable. Sansbury asserted that the WCC should go directly, and in the first instance, through the National Council of a particular country, not through other Christian figures. That they didn't suggests that Mason's decade-long work in the English Christian 'race relations' area was held in high esteem by the WCC. In order to try to regain some control over the situation, Sansbury co-opted Mason as an observer of the BCC's Committee on Migration and also appointed him to serve as the official representative of the BCC for the Consultation planning.⁷⁵⁷

The records are not complete, but the crux of Sansbury's concerns seems to have been not only that the WCC went over the heads of the BCC leaders to deal with Mason directly, but also that the BCC was worried about inflaming public opinion in respect of 'race' and 'race relations'.⁷⁵⁸ Sansbury said,

I was very glad to hear from David Mason, on his return from the recent meeting in Geneva, that the Consultation on Race had been transferred from Birmingham to London and that no public meetings were now being planned in connection with it. The important thing I am sure at the present time in this country is that this inflammatory subject be dealt with firmly but calmly and that we avoid the kind of situation which can produce an emotional white back-lash.⁷⁵⁹

Sansbury's reticence about publicly discussing 'race' and racism represented something of a standard white liberal English mindset when it came to these particular issues. As shall be shown below, this mindset as shown by the contributions of many of the white English participants, was starkly different to the overall tone and mood of the Consultation. In the end, despite Sansbury's concerns, a public meeting complete with controversy did in fact occur and this event will be returned to below. What is important to note for the moment is that it was Mason's relationship with the WCC which eventually led to the Consultation being held at the Ecumenical Centre, although the public meeting

757 WCC, 4223.1.03, Memorandum from David Gill to Eugene Carson Blake, 3 January 1969. Letter from Kenneth Sansbury to Eugene Carson Blake, 14 January 1969. 4223.1.01, Minutes of the Meeting of Staff Coordinating Committee on Racism, 20 January 1969.

758 Sansbury's initial comments were not located at either the WCC or the BCC archives. WCC, 4223.1.03, Memorandum from David Gill to Eugene Carson Blake, 3 January 1969. Memorandum from David Gill to Rena Karefa-Smart, 3 January 1969. Letter from Rena Karefa-Smart to David Mason, 27 January 1969.

759 WCC, 4223.1.03, Letter from Kenneth Sansbury to Eugene Carson Blake, 14 January 1969.

was held at the larger Church House, Westminster.⁷⁶⁰

The Notting Hill Consultation was held over six days – 19 to 24 May 1969 – and included various activities from bible study, formal presentations, evening prayers, and panel discussions. As a point of note, the WCC calls for a Consultation when it needs to make a decision on a matter. The Notting Hill Consultation was then a way of making decisions on the theme of white racism which was raised at the Uppsala Assembly (see Chapter One). The Notting Hill Consultation sought to explore two main areas: the nature, cause, and consequences of racism in contemporary conflict situations with specific reference to white racism; and to evaluate Christian positions and actions and to set forth a new programme of education and action for the WCC and its member churches. In order to fully explore these aspects of racism and anti-racism, forty Christian participants (including four Roman Catholics, despite their non-participation in the WCC on a corporate level) were to engage in discussion with twenty five consultants who had practical and personal experience in 'racial confrontations in many different parts of the world'. Importantly, an observer noted that many of these consultants 'were battle-weary troops just off the front-lines' who were 'trying to put up some sign-posts to point the churches to where the real action is'.⁷⁶¹ Moreover, the consultants themselves were not necessarily Christian and all were critical of the churches in general.⁷⁶²

As will be shown below, the Consultation was a significant moment in history – English, British, and global. The decisions made as a consequence of it would impact, and resonate amongst, many more than the global Christian community. Sivanandan, who was one of the official consultants for the event, considered the Consultation not only *generally* important, but also a pivotal moment in his own life in terms of the connections he made and the politicisation the

760 WCC, 4223.1.01, Memorandum from Rena Karefa-Smart to Eugene Blake, Consultation on Racism (Arrangements), 7 February 1969.

761 WCC, 4223.1.03, William Crane, From the Politics of Consultation to those of Confrontation: The 1969 WCC Consultation on Racism on the perspective of the historic ecumenical concern for race relations, n.d., c. 1969.

762 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. Elizabeth Adler, *A Small Beginning: An assessment of the first five years of the Programme to Combat Racism* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1974), p. 11.

Consultation (and other events in his life at that time) provided him with.⁷⁶³

Likewise, Eugene Carson Blake, the General Secretary of the WCC said, 'no person who went through the experience came out unaffected'.⁷⁶⁴ Similarly, the US Senator George McGovern who served as the chair for the Consultation noted how each person present was 'forced to look anew at his own heart, his own practices, his own sins of commission and omission as a churchman and as a citizen'.⁷⁶⁵ Kenneth Sansbury noted that many of the British people present had something of an 'Aldersgate Street experience' as they were exposed in profound ways to 'the evils of racism and of the bitter humiliation it can bring'.⁷⁶⁶

It is important to remember the general milieu in which the Consultation sat: the world was changing rapidly and the decade prior had witnessed the passing of the Civil Rights Bill in the USA and the two Race Relations Acts in the UK. It had also seen South African apartheid strengthen, seen British nationality narrow and whiten, seen the rise of Powellism, and witnessed the murders of both Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.. Furthermore, it had seen the rise of colonial violence in certain parts of Africa and the independence of many African and Caribbean countries. Not to mention a brutal and bloody war in Vietnam, and leaders from the global south speaking at the United Nations in their own right for the first time. As Elizabeth Adler has said, in the later part of the sixties the oppressed of the world 'began to raise their voices and to reveal the ugly face of neo-colonialist, imperialist and racist structures, pointing to the confluence of race with social and economic status at both the national and international level'.⁷⁶⁷ Furthermore, these global changes of the sixties meant significant changes to the composition of the WCC. It had gone from twenty-nine percent of member churches (42 of 146) being based in the global south at the time of its formation in 1948, to forty-one percent of member churches (103 of 253) being based in the global south by the time of the Uppsala Assembly in

763 In particular, Sivanandan singled out Oodgeroo Noonuccal, aka Kath Walker, an Aboriginal writer from Australia as influencing him the most. Sivanandan and Bourne, Interviewed by the author.

764 WCC, 4223.1.03, Eugene Carson Blake, 'Forward', World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

765 WCC, 4223.1.03, Eugene Carson Blake, 'Forward', World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

766 An 'Aldersgate (Street) experience' refers to the conversion experience of John Wesley. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 9.

767 Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 5.

1968. As such, there were new voices within the Council itself which led to different discussions about, and different perspectives on, 'race' and racism. However, despite this shift, white dominance in terms of the WCC leadership meant that, within the hierarchy of the WCC, it was sometimes a struggle for the voices of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to be fully heard.⁷⁶⁸

Given the framework generated by the Uppsala Assembly and the structure and title of the 1969 Consultation, the themes of Black Power and white racism were to dominate the Notting Hill event and were formally acknowledged by the Consultation report as: identity, power, and reparations.⁷⁶⁹ However, despite the attention to *white* racism, it should be noted that the Notting Hill Consultation was not solely dedicated to British, European, North American, Australian, or New Zealand racisms, although it was subsequently criticised for being dominated by North American points of view.⁷⁷⁰ It therefore paid attention to the situation of Koreans in Japan; the Biafran and Vietnam wars; racism in the UK and in the USA; student protests in Czechoslovakia, France, Japan, USA and the UK; and poverty and racism in Latin America, Malaysia, India, Pakistan, southern Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.⁷⁷¹

Chapter One noted that the concept of 'race' was generally under-theorised in Christian circles in the sixties due to the obfuscations of the 'race relations' paradigm. Given the shift in focus from 'race relations' to racism in the 1969 Consultation, it is of no surprise to find that the concept was grappled with slightly more coherently. At this juncture, Christians had not yet emphatically rejected the concept of 'race' but were trying to find ways to deploy it in order to

768 Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 5. For an overview of the sixties see: See, Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, C. 1958-1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

769 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. For an overview of the Consultation see: Vincent, *The Race Race*; and, Mulhall, *A Lasting Prophetic Legacy*, pp. 150–178.

770 See, for instance, John Vincent, 'Black Power dominates race consultation: Five working days at Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 29 May 1969, p. 16. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 9. Although, as another commentator pointed out, 'The American situation may not be universally relevant and a guide to racist conditions elsewhere, but it produces a bitterness, an urgency, and a sophistication of argument which improves the diagnosis of racism anywhere'. Campbell Page, 'The Church cries revolution', *Guardian*, 26 May 1969, p. 9.

771 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. Ian Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: The Non-Problem of Race', *Pro Veritate*, 8 (15 August 1969), 9–10 (p. 9).

describe, or account for, phenotypal differences in a way which did not necessarily lead to racist beliefs. For instance, K.M. Beckman – a German Theologian – gave a history of European thinking on race, including Gobineau, Chamberlain, Darwin, and Hitler. He attempted to use their frameworks of racialised difference whilst at the same time underscoring the sociological and psychological aspects of 'the race problem'. Beckman noted that Europeans often confused 'culture' and/or 'nationality' with 'race', and that the major problem in the world – world hunger – existed because of the consequences of the idea of 'race'. Elsewhere, the final report of the Consultation acknowledged the ambiguity of the term, noting that it was used in different ways by different people: for instance, anthropologists might use it in one way, sociologists in another. The report's authors therefore referred to the 1967 UNESCO Statement on Race and Racial Prejudice and accepted the document's standpoint and clarifications on the concept. Hence, the official WCC position post-Consultation was that they did *not* use 'race' in a biological sense and instead asserted that 'race' was 'a social reality according to which people act and react'.⁷⁷²

The Consultation opened with the WCC in a somewhat self-critical state. This is important to hold in mind as it was a legacy of Uppsala and it explains the willingness and openness to approach the problem anew. Willem Adolph Visser 't Hooft, the first secretary general of the WCC, spoke on the first day and was deeply critical of how the ecumenical movement had approached 'race' and racism thus far. He stated that the churches had failed to properly fight Nazism, had focused too much on the theological aspects of South African apartheid, and had failed to act on a local level to make the churches inclusive. Therefore, alongside condemning the churches for not making the sacrifices necessary to achieve racial justice, he also condemned them for believing too much in declarations, for failing to attend to the economics of racism, and for being unclear on 'the problem of violence and non-violence as methods of

⁷⁷² WCC, 4223.1.02, K.M. Beckman, European Thinking on Race, Document No. 1/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969. 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. UNESCO, Statement on Race and Racial Prejudice, 18-26 September 1967, 1–5 <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001860/186096eb.pdf>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

transforming present patterns and present structures'.⁷⁷³

Significantly, Visser 't Hooft speaking as a theologian and *before* the Declaration of Revolution was issued on the afternoon of Friday 23 May by Black Power activists, brought up the issue of violent opposition to oppressive situations. In fact, the issue had first been discussed at the 1964 Mindolo Consultation on South Africa, whereby fears over the increasing rise of violent revolutionary attitudes were noted due to the persistence of white domination and violence. At that time, reconciliation was emphasised because of these fears; but by the 1969 Consultation, Visser 't Hooft instead noted that it was becoming harder and harder to justify *not* using violence. Therefore, he asserted that the churches needed to 'take up the traditional concept of the right of resistance to tyranny', and, importantly, noted that theologians of the Reformation era recognised this right. Finally, his speech ended with a plea to follow the 'prophetic voice' of the African-American writer and philosopher Alain Locke, who had argued forty-years prior for a global cultural pluralism.⁷⁷⁴ Visser 't Hooft's speech is important on several levels as his stance reflected the overall official position of the WCC post-Consultation and shows how ready the leaders of the WCC were to accept and enact change.

Importantly, and very differently from the ways in which Christians discussed and approached 'race'-related subjects earlier in the decade, Visser 't Hooft (and the Consultation more generally) set racism within the context of the just distribution of various forms of power: economic, political, and scientific. The problem of white racism was therefore rooted in a corresponding acknowledgement of global power imbalances. Church departments in the global north which passed aid onto poorer churches in developing countries were beginning 'to face the question whether the problem of world hunger can ever be solved without a radical restructuring of the economic system'.⁷⁷⁵ A question which still remains relevant today. In this framework, 'race relations' gave way to a discussion of racism which was 'seen as a pattern of attitudes and values that develop in a situation where there is already injustice and

773 WCC, 4223.1.02, Dr W.A. Visser 't Hooft, Reflections on World Council of Churches' Action Concerning Interracial Relations, Document No. 6/E, World Council of Churches Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

774 *Ibid.*

775 Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 13.

discrimination'.⁷⁷⁶ Indeed, as Sivanandan was to later state in a 1972 application to the WCC's Programme to Combat Racism (PCR) in respect of the Institute of Race Relations, the Consultation marked a juncture whereby the WCC too had 'come to acknowledge that the problem it seeks to resolve is not concerned with race relations as such, but with racism'.⁷⁷⁷ Therefore, racism was not seen 'as the *cause* of injustice but rather as an *effect* of long-standing injustice and exploitation or as a *means* used to justify the status quo'.⁷⁷⁸

Prior to this Consultation, despite all the declarations, discussions and studies, there had been very little *action* on the part of the churches. As Elizabeth Adler noted, the weakness of the earlier pronouncements on 'race' and racism were that,

they put much emphasis on race relations and did not expose sufficiently the existence of racist structures; they were very church-centred [...]; and they saw racism as primarily a phenomenon existing in particular societies where several races lived together, and were hardly aware of the international power structures supporting it.⁷⁷⁹

However, as was highlighted in Chapter One, beginning slowly and quietly in 1966 with the acknowledgement that charity was not enough and that the exploitative racialised economic and political structures must be changed, there was now an openness on the part of the WCC to rectify this failure. The WCC had begun to recognise itself, and the churches more generally, as being part of the complicated global intersecting power structures and economic forces which dominated human relationships and oppressed many non-white people. As such, Uppsala and Notting Hill represent moments whereby the WCC recognised itself historically as an exploitative force within that matrix. As we shall see below, a significant outcome of the Notting Hill Consultation was the attempt to remedy that history of exploitation and create a future of anti-racist

⁷⁷⁶ Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: The Non-Problem of Race', p. 9. William Crane made an important point that, despite the radical departure from prior ecumenical statements on 'race relations' which the Consultation, the PCR, and the Special Fund represented, it must be remembered that these post-1969 actions and standpoints did emerge from this liberal 'race relations' field. It therefore has its merits as a seed bed. WCC, 4223.1.03, William Crane, From the Politics of Consultation to those of Confrontation: The 1969 WCC Consultation on Racism on the perspective of the historic ecumenical concern for race relations, n.d., c. 1969.

⁷⁷⁷ WCC, 4223.3.38, Institute of Race Relations – Aims, 27 July 1972.

⁷⁷⁸ Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: The Non-Problem of Race', p. 9, *emphasis his*.

⁷⁷⁹ Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 10.

solidarity and action by way of the creation of the PCR and the Special Fund.

Uppsala and the Notting Hill Consultation reflected a turn from the language of problematic relationships between 'races' which need to be solved, to an acknowledgement that the real problem was racism, specifically the racism of white people. Much of this can be understood in the context of the coupling of a traditional attendance to poverty with that of an attendance to global economic and power discrepancies. This was, of course, a critique of capitalism, and to this end Channing Phillips, a Consultation participant, asked if it was that the very nature of capitalism depended 'upon the existence of a scapegoat class, currently the black man?'.⁷⁸⁰ It was acknowledged that, in a global sense, white people had an unequal amount of economic and political power, which in turn meant that the racism of white people was the most dangerous. In the words of the final Consultation report, the root cause of racism was seen as 'the gross imbalance of politico-economic power between the white and coloured races'.⁷⁸¹

This change in attention from 'race relations' to white racism effectively symbolised a new set of questions and a limited engagement with Marxist critique. This engagement was also given voice in the two contributions by Sivanandan – 'The Revolt of the Natives' and 'White Racism and Black Consciousness' – whose overall emphasis was on capitalism as 'the prime cause of racism'. In his contributions, and particularly in 'White Racism and Black Consciousness', Sivanandan effectively presented his audience with a new set of questions: was it that Christians should talk of a Christian view on 'race relations', or instead should Christianity be viewed from the vantage of racial exploitation? How had Christianity historically justified this exploitation through notions of original sin and the creation of a blonde haired, blue eyed god? Sivanandan's questions were, of course, rhetorical, and we have seen official WCC admissions of the historical Christian involvement with racism at Uppsala, yet his speech was important as it represented just one of the many indictments of Christianity which were aired throughout the Consultation. Moreover, it was one of several speeches which strongly insisted, as Richard

780 WCC, 4223.1.02, Channing E. Phillips, *The Color of Poverty: Political and Economic Relationships*.

781 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

Wright had done twelve years earlier, *White Man, Listen!*⁷⁸²

Contained within this call to attention was the sentiment that, should white Christians not listen, then the church itself was lost. In other words, should the global church continue to fail to hear the black voices of the world, then it would collapse under the weight of itself. For instance, the black American Presbyterian minister Gayraud Wilmore was to effectively call for a decolonisation of Christian theology and practise. Wilmore believed that,

It is not merely segregation or integration which are at stake today. It is rather the question of the viability of the Christian Church in the United States – and perhaps in Western civilisation. It is the question of whether or not this church can any longer encompass within it the masses of nonwhite persons, who make up the majority of the peoples of the earth, without undergoing radical changes in its understanding of its purpose in the world vis-a-vis robbed, subjugated, and excluded peoples, without dismantling its organizational structures for mission and without bringing to an end its basic conformity to European theological traditions and Anglo-Saxon styles of life and structures of value. The church cannot proceed through this period of crisis as a viable and relevant institution without a radical change in its spiritual and physical relationship to Black Christians – most of whom are in all black churches – and to the black community as a whole.⁷⁸³

In this same vein, the Revd Daisuke Kitagawa and Roger Harless (a prominent white American civil rights activist) both underscored the necessity of white Christians (and white people more generally) to *listen* to the voices of black Christians. Harless made reference to the fact that theology had often undergirded racism which in turn bolstered economic exploitation, and then went on to underscore the dehumanising aspects of white racism on white people. As such, Harless asserted that the first role of the WCC, and white people more generally, was to understand white racism in its institutionalised aspects; the second role was 'simply to be a victim, to stand by and to be a target of the revolution'.⁷⁸⁴ Similarly, Kitagawa asserted that the white churches

782 WCC, 4223.1.02, Ambalavaner Sivanandan, The Revolt of the Natives, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969. Ambalavaner Sivanandan, *White Racism and Black Consciousness*, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969. This speech was later published as: 'Race: The Revolutionary Experience'. Richard Wright, 'White Man, Listen!', in *Black Power. Three Books from Exile: Black Power; The Colour Curtain; and White Man, Listen!*, by Richard Wright (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2008), pp. 631–812.

783 WCC, 4223.1.02, Gayraud S. Wilmore, Jr., The Case for a New Black Church Style, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

784 WCC, 4223.1.02, Roger A. Harless, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on

needed to admit their ignorance both of the predicament of black people and of racial conflict. This admission would then enable them to seek guidance from black churches (and black caucuses within white churches) in order to build a new America. He said,

White Christians must learn to sit at the feet of competent black leaders before they can stand side by side with them and work hand in hand with them. This is one thing which few – and what a precious few they are – white Americans have learned up to now.⁷⁸⁵

An insistence on the important specificity of *black voices* necessitated the churches coming to terms with identity in a new way, which given the year, meant an engagement with Black Power. Moreover, in order to encounter and engage with Black Power on its own terms, Christians had to move past their usual, universalising platitudes of 'we are all God's children'. However, at the same time, as Fr. Lewis Donnelly (a Roman Catholic observer-participant at the Consultation) remarked, 'The issue of "identity" proved a major challenge to the Consultation which, sympathetic as it felt to the demands for Black Power, had to define it in terms which would give no comfort to the advocates of apartheid'.⁷⁸⁶ By way of solving this dilemma, the final report of the Consultation saw an affirmation of support for the utility of racialised identities which must be allowed to develop 'in full and responsible freedom'. However, at the same time, the report's authors continued to ground their position in the common humanity of each human being. They therefore stated that racialised identities could work together for the common good of humanity, and that no one particular 'racial-cultural pattern' should be held as the standard to which all others were judged. In this way, the report's authors affirmed that racialised identities were the crucible within which personal identities were formed and therefore should be respected and protected. Moreover,

in recognizing his 'racial identity,' the victim of racism not only sees his personal value in a context of racial equality, but discovers a cohesiveness

Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

785 WCC, 4223.1.02, Daisuke Kitagawa, Black Power, White Racism and the Church: USA, 1968, Document No. 7/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

786 Lewis Donnelly, 'Report from Notting Hill', *Tablet*, 31 May 1969, p. 21. As William Crane noted, on this particular issue, the situation in South Africa was quite different from that of the UK. WCC, 4223.1.03, William Crane, From the Politics of Consultation to those of Confrontation: The 1969 WCC Consultation on Racism on the perspective of the historic ecumenical concern for race relations, n.d., c. 1969.

with his brothers which gives leverage to his confrontation with the racist and to his demand for the recognition and power which is essential to his sense of identity.⁷⁸⁷

Whilst the Consultation was not the first time the WCC had listened to ideas of Black Power at a gathering (as we saw in Chapter One, James Baldwin also spoke on it at Uppsala), it was the first time the ideology was given sustained treatment by several speakers. For instance, Revd Daisuke Kitagawa framed white American responses to Black Power as being predicated on fear and as a refusal to engage sincerely with black Americans.⁷⁸⁸ Kitagawa's summation of the meaning of Black Power is illuminating in its simplicity and is therefore worth quoting in length. He said that through the language and discourse of Black Power, black Americans were affirming themselves as,

first class American citizens in their own rights, their racial heritage and colour of skin notwithstanding. Whether or not white Americans will accept them is now completely beside the point, they are, as they are, as much American citizens as any white persons. This is what they rightfully are saying – nothing more, nothing else and certainly nothing less.

With this development, black and white Americans have at long last reached the point where they can have an authentic confrontation with each other and engage with each other in a genuine dialogue. The problem as I see it is that while black Americans are ready to engage white Americans in dialogue, an overwhelmingly large majority of white Americans are hardly ready for it and do not want it. It would be more honest to say that dialogue is about the last thing most white Americans want, and that for one simple reason: White Americans are afraid. Basically they are a fear-ridden people.

Why and of what are they afraid? To put it bluntly, they are afraid black Americans might retaliate – they might do to white people what white people have done to them in the past'.⁷⁸⁹

This fear, according to Kitagawa, stopped white Americans from stepping out of 'lily-white suburbia' to truly meet black people and dialogue with them openly. This refusal to meet as equals reinforced the walls between white and black people and therefore perpetuated white racism as a way of maintaining white privilege.⁷⁹⁰

787 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

788 WCC, 4223.1.02, Daisuke Kitagawa, Black Power, White Racism and the Church: USA, 1968, Document No. 7/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

789 *Ibid.*, emphasis his.

790 *Ibid.*.

This acknowledgement of white racism in conjunction with Black Power meant a redefinition of Christian ethics. In this way, Fr. James Groppi, a famed white Roman Catholic civil rights activist from Milwaukee, noted how the violence in Milwaukee in the summer of 1967 had been called a riot by white churches and communities, yet he, alongside black communities, saw it as a revolutionary act. He told of how his parishioners walked past him carrying furniture and food, shouting 'Black Power Father', to which he replied, 'Black Power Jo – don't get caught'.⁷⁹¹ This anecdote was designed to illustrate how, working in a poor, black parish, he had to work differently to priests working in rich, white parishes. He said,

A child going to confession in the white community would confess the sin of stealing and the priest there would most likely consider it a sin and ask for restitution. But if a child in the black community living in a poverty situation and who knows the pangs of hunger would come to me in the Sacrament of Confession and say that he had stolen from the supermarkets I would tell him that this is not a sin. I would tell him that God never meant for him to be hungry and to allow all that food to sit in the supermarket. That food belongs to him. I would tell him to be careful not to get caught.⁷⁹²

For Groppi, the importance of Black Power was that it brought, 'power to a powerless people and with that power comes dignity and self-respect'.⁷⁹³

These five acknowledgements – the economic complicity of the churches with racism, an admission that this was undermining the credibility and integrity of the church, the subsequent necessity of racialised identities as part of fighting back against white racism (in opposition to the traditional universalised Christian identity), the need for white Christians to place black voices and black lives first, and the redefinition of Christian ethics to become in line with the oppressed –

791 WCC, 4223.1.02, James Groppi, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969. See the following for more information on Groppi: Patrick D. Jones, *The Selma of the North: Civil Rights Insurgency in Milwaukee* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009).

792 WCC, 4223.1.02, James Groppi, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969. This point of view was also articulated by Father Borrelli of Naples, the so-called 'Priest of the Urchins', at a meeting held at the NHMC during the 1967 Notting Hill Summer Project. 'Volunteer force in big check on homes in Notting Hill. Father Borelli [sic] Here', *Kensington Post*, 28 July 1967, p. 1. "Priest of the Urchins" at Notting Hill, *Kensington Post*, 4 August 1967, p. 1.

793 WCC, 4223.1.02, James Groppi, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

represented a tremendous shift in Christian thinking about 'race' and 'race relations'. It was an adversarial, critical, and defiant position but one being made by more and more (Christian) activists around the world. But more, by engaging with the challenges of Black Power and by centralising white racism, it fundamentally signalled an end to 'race relations' in its liberal, assimilationist-integrationist form. Before turning to discuss this aspect of the Consultation further, the following section shows how two activists with strong ties to South Africa utilised the themes of resistance to, and condemnation of, white domination in the context of their speeches at the Public Meeting at Church House, Westminster.

Oliver Tambo and Trevor Huddleston: The Indictment of Christianity

Whilst the main Consultation was held at the Ecumenical Centre in Notting Hill, there was also a ticketed public meeting on the evening of 21 May 1969 at Church House, Westminster. The speakers were Oliver Tambo and Trevor Huddleston and they spoke on the subject of 'Racism as a Major Obstacle to World Community'. The original pairing for this session was somewhat different: the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr Eduardo Mondlane, the leader of FRELIMO. Mondlane had participated in several WCC meetings, including the 1964 Mindolo Consultation on 'race' and was therefore an obvious choice for the WCC, as was Ramsey for other clear reasons. However, the assassination of Mondlane on 3 February in Daar es Salaam meant that the organising committee had to search for a replacement speaker. David Mason's London Committee highly recommended Stuart Hall to serve in Mondlane's place, but the WCC felt that it should be someone from another country as a British representative (Ramsey) was already speaking.⁷⁹⁴

It is worth commenting briefly on the thoughts of the WCC organising committee in respect of the murder of Mondlane as it reflects how quickly and definitively the official position of the WCC changed as a consequence of the Notting Hill Consultation. The committee obviously felt that the world had suffered a grave

⁷⁹⁴ WCC, 4223.1.01, Minutes of the Meeting of Staff Coordinating Committee on Racism, 20 January 1969. Memorandum from Rena Karefa-Smart to Eugene Blake, Consultation on Racism (Arrangements), 7 February 1969. Minutes of the Meeting of Staff Coordinating Committee on Racism, 11 February 1969. Minutes of the Meeting of Staff Coordinating Committee on Racism, 25 March 1969. 'Bomb kills Mozambique rebel leader', *The Times*, 4 February 1969, p. 4.

loss with Mondlane's assassination and it saw Baldwin Sjollema impress 'the need to go deeper into the response of the World Council of Churches and member Churches vis à vis Freedom Movements'. Yet, whilst sending private cables to Mondlane's widow, they could not decide on any official statement of sympathy to FRELIMO as they did not have a clear understanding of the official WCC position. As chairman, Eugene Carson Blake observed 'that the World Council's position is always to give quiet support to "casualties" of Liberation Movements; to be quietly friendly and helpful without taking sides in revolutionary struggles'.⁷⁹⁵ As will be seen below, this was a position soon to change.

Oliver Tambo was asked to share the platform with Archbishop Ramsey for the closing public event because it was felt that his involvement in the ANC, and the situation in South Africa more generally, would enable him to speak forcefully on 'the global aspect of racial unrest'. However, despite being willing to share a platform with Mondlane, sharing with Tambo was to prove problematic for Ramsey. Ramsey's secretary, Robert Beloe, suggested that sharing a platform with Tambo would negatively affect Ramsey's scheduled visit to South Africa in 1970 since Tambo had now transitioned from non-violent to violent opposition to the apartheid state. Beloe noted that, 'Tambo is regarded by S.A. as a self-acknowledged enemy and their disapproval of you [Ramsey] in the context I have described would be predictably prompt and strong'. It would seem that Ramsey feared the criticisms of a vicious apartheid regime because it might affect his ability to achieve 'understanding with people in South Africa who needed his help'. Although one wonders how the *victims* of the apartheid state would fail to understand him in this respect.⁷⁹⁶

Using advice gained from the Foreign Office, Beloe also suggested that, rather than dropping out or asking for Tambo to be dropped, Ramsey should ask the WCC to rearrange the speakers so that he would not share a platform with Tambo. Beloe therefore flew to Geneva to meet with Rena Karefa-Smart and Eugene Carson Blake to make the Archbishop's case which included him

⁷⁹⁵ WCC, 4223.1.01, Minutes of the Meeting of Staff Coordinating Committee on Racism, 11 February 1969.

⁷⁹⁶ To this end, Beloe provided Ramsey with two editions of *Sechaba*, the official journal of the ANC, which contained articles by Tambo as evidence of Tambo's position on the transition from non-violent to violent opposition to the apartheid state. LPA, Ramsey 174, ff. 5–6, 9–10, 12–15, 22–25.

stating that 'the Archbishop did not need "to stand up and be counted" as an opponent of racism. His record in the United Kingdom and his known attitude and stand about events overseas were clear'. Despite differing interpretations of Ramsey's position on racism, what *is* clear from the records is that Rena Karefa-Smart in particular was unhappy about this refusal by the Archbishop. Eventually though, Ramsey was moved to the plenary session on 21 May wherein he was to lead bible study and chair a discussion on 'The Struggle to Deracimize'. It was therefore left to Trevor Huddleston to take the Archbishop's place alongside Tambo.⁷⁹⁷

Oliver Tambo's speech opened by citing W.E.B. Du Bois' comments on the colour line as the problem of the twentieth-century. He commented on both the horrors of the Second World War and on how the menace of racism was threatening to develop into an international conflict worse than anything yet seen in the history of humankind. The racism of B.J. Vorster (then the Prime Minister of South Africa) he said, was second only to that of Hitler. Tambo distinguished between interpersonal conflict, with which he was not concerned, and racism 'as a virulent, aggressive and violent ideology which would sooner destroy millions of people than accept the universal truth that racial origin is a fact of natural birth, not a measure of human worth'. Tambo noted how the 'hatred and hostility' which fed on and nourished racism was sustained by myths such as the concept of 'white, western or Christian civilization' which was 'a subtle and ingenious device to foster acceptance of the doctrine of white superiority and black inferiority'.⁷⁹⁸

Tambo noted the tenacity of racist myths of superiority and inferiority. He told his audience how most religious people and politicians (South Africa aside) accepted the concept of the unity of humankind and the ideals of a world community, but yet and still, virulent racism prevailed.⁷⁹⁹ In fact, despite the rise of mass education which should have expelled racist myths,

it is these very times of ours which have witnessed the most fearful eruptions of genocide in which the cruelties of the medieval pogrom were dehumanized and systematized by the cold-blooded operations of the gas-

797 LPA, Ramsey 174, ff. 32–35, 49–52.

798 These war themes will be familiar to readers from the letters analysed in the previous chapter. WCC, 4223.1.02, O.R. Tambo, Racism as a Major Obstacle to World Community, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19–24 May 1969.

799 *Ibid.*.

chambers, the gold fillings of the victim's teeth cost-accounted by computer, the discoveries of an Einstein expressed in the obliteration of the human beings of Hiroshima.⁸⁰⁰

Education and scientific advancement had then *increased* European and American capacities for racist violence, not relieved them of an ignorance which may have led to it. Tambo reminded his listeners that Hiroshima and Auschwitz were the violent, racist acts of State policy, not acts of the backward or the ignorant. As such, the acts belonged to those who claimed to be the pinnacle of civilisation and of political, moral and economic progress; and, importantly, they also belonged to those states who the less powerful nations were often compelled to emulate.⁸⁰¹

Linking movements in southern Africa to Black Power movements in the USA, Tambo situated them as worldwide revolutionary movements aimed at replacing the old world order with one founded on proper understandings of human nature, justice, and history. The time for non-violence had long passed since all it had engendered was the continuation of racist oppression. Moreover, as northern African states slowly freed themselves from the yoke of colonialism, the white oppressors in the south of the continent steadily increased the levels of violence they practised.⁸⁰² Strikingly he said the world was,

witnessing racism, in all its naked reality, rising slowly with a snarl, like a wounded monster, ready to engage the revolutionary hordes surrounding it in a titanic and desperate struggle for survival. I am part of these hordes. You call them terrorists; I call them the standard-bearers of the forces of freedom, the sworn enemies of racial tyranny and colonial exploitation. [...] [V]olunteers who have freely answered the call to rid mankind of the scourge of racism, colonialism and imperialism.⁸⁰³

As was now commonplace amongst black and white activists, Tambo was also concerned to root racist oppression in the economic sphere. As such, Tambo asserted that racism existed mainly to serve the economic interests of certain groups of people who originated in western Christian civilisation. Tambo said that those groups of people exploited black people not because they were black but because it was necessary for their economic profits. However, these same western Christian people simultaneously used the fact of an oppressed person's

800 WCC, 4223.1.02, O.R. Tambo, Racism as a Major Obstacle to World Community, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

801 *Ibid.*

802 *Ibid.*

803 *Ibid.*

black skin to excuse the exploitation. Racism existed as it was necessary to the logic of capitalism, and more, this capitalism and the racism it relied on was historically and intimately bound to the Church.⁸⁰⁴

In closing, Tambo warned that the Consultation would have been for nought should it fail to translate words into action. If it failed,

to initiate a clean and categorical break with racism by calling upon the member churches of the Council, individually and collectively, to throw their *moral and material resources* behind the struggle for the defeat of racism and in support of those who seek, by the sacrifice of their lives, to establish a world society of peoples free from hunger, disease and ignorance – rich in the variety of its colours, races and creeds.⁸⁰⁵

In this, Tambo issued a challenge to Christians by holding the example of the South African Communist Bram Fischer above that of Christians, by invoking in him the virtues of self-sacrifice and lack of personal ambition, which he found sorely lacking in Christians. But then too, as something of a rejoinder to that, he ended on a hymn: we shall overcome.⁸⁰⁶

Trevor Huddleston's speech was similarly challenging and not without controversy. Despite his fame for speaking out on issues of 'race', 'immigration', and racism, Huddleston was reluctant to speak at the Consultation for two main reasons. Firstly, because he did not feel himself to be an expert on 'race relations' in Britain having only been back in the country ten months; and secondly, because he was weary of the constant *talk* regarding 'race relations'. Although he did stress the importance of fully *listening* to Tambo as an important voice of southern Africa. However, speak he did and Huddleston once again rooted the British situation in an international context owing to his belief in the catholicity, or universality of Christianity, which necessarily entailed approaching 'race relations' from an international (as opposed to a local or national) point of view. Furthermore, he underscored this internationalism because his 'impression of our society in Great Britain is of a society already so introspective, self-centred and neurotic that I don't wish to add to the sickness of it by isolating the issue of race-relations as if it were some kind of incurable disease'. This introspective, neurotic, and self-centred point of view was one

804 WCC, 4223.1.02, O.R. Tambo, Racism as a Major Obstacle to World Community, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

805 *Ibid.*

806 *Ibid.*

which Huddleston attributed to Powell whom he also called a 'little Englander' who was succeeding in shrinking the nation economically, internationally, and morally.⁸⁰⁷

It was at this juncture that controversy erupted as it transpired that several members of the National Front (NF) had somehow obtained tickets to the public meeting and they therefore took the opportunity to disrupt the proceedings. When Huddleston criticised Powell, all of a sudden cheers for Enoch Powell, Ian Smith, and even Ian Paisley, as well as shouts of 'red scum', 'keep Britain white', and 'integration means miscegenation' arose from a group of people in the gallery. Reports vary from between eighty to a hundred NF members being present. David Mason vividly recalls the group standing up in the gallery and loudly shouting 'Enoch! Enoch! Enoch!' at Huddleston. As was to be expected, Huddleston was not their only target, and alongside jeering him, the NF supporters also shouted racist taunts at Oliver Tambo.⁸⁰⁸

Naturally, the fascist outburst was 'sickening and unsettling' to an audience drawn together to combat the ideology the fascists espoused and, as George Clarke was to say, the interruptions left 'no questions as to the virulence of the racial situation and the feelings underlying it'.⁸⁰⁹ Yet, at the same time, George McGovern stated that,

one saw this outrageous situation draw the conference participants together in a new spirit of fellowship as we witnessed with new force the brazen face of racial ignorance and prejudice. Nothing the consultation could have done could have so eloquently underscored the sin of racism as did the intemperate outburst of these practicing, shouting British racists.⁸¹⁰

In the end, the National Front supporters held up Huddleston's speech for over

807 THP, 371, Text of the Bishop of Stepney's Speech to the World Council of Churches' Consultation on Racism, Church House Westminster: 21 May 1969. Also available in: WCC, 4223.1.02.

808 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. J. Robert Nelson, 'If It's Any Comfort – We Are Not Alone', *Episcopalian*, August 1969, pp. 21–22. LPA, Ramsey 174, ff. 84. Mason, Interviewed by the author. Ian Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', *Pro Veritate*, 8 (15 September 1969), 4–6 (p. 4).

809 WCC, 4223.1.02, Statement by George Clarke, Notting Hill Housing Service, n.d., c. May 1969.

810 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

fifteen minutes through constant interruptions until around twenty police officers arrived to remove them, at which point they threw leaflets down upon the crowd below before being taken out. Brian Frost said that it is still unclear how the NF obtained the tickets, since the tickets were privately distributed by David Mason himself. It would therefore seem that somebody trusted gave them the tickets, but neither Frost nor Mason ever discovered who.⁸¹¹

As with his internationalism, Huddleston again rooted his arguments in history by underscoring Britain's role in the slave trade. He reminded his audience that the abolition of slavery did not absolve the nation of the crime of committing slavery in the first place, nor did it absolve it more generally of the crime of colonialism. Furthermore, he noted the *proximity* of colonialism, and of how colonial attitudes take longer than a decade to disappear, and of 'the traumatic effect upon our national psychology of having "lost and Empire and not found a role"'. Singling out the situation in Rhodesia at that time – Ian Smith and the Unilateral Declaration of Independence – Huddleston noted that it had alienated newly independent African nations from Britain and signified a contempt from within Britain for 'African sensitivities, African culture, [and] African political institutions'. And it was this contempt, Huddleston believed, which created many of the 'race'-based tensions in Britain.⁸¹²

In Huddleston's view, given the moral aspect of 'race relations', the Christian Church was best placed to lead the way in this area. The Church existed as a national presence 'penetrating the whole social fabric of our country' and should therefore work in partnership with organisations such as Runnymede, the Institute of Race Relations, and the Martin Luther King Foundation. However, he referred back to James Baldwin's speech at Uppsala which contained a strong indictment of the effectiveness of organised Christianity to actually achieve anything of merit in this area. As many others did at this time, Huddleston also linked 'race relations' to global issues of hunger and poverty and ended by impressing upon his audience the urgency of the situation and how, should

811 John Vincent, 'Black Power dominates race consultation: Five working days at Notting Hill', *Methodist Recorder*, 29 May 1969, p. 16. WCC, 4223.1.03, J. Robert Nelson, 'If It's Any Comfort – We Are Not Alone', *Episcopalian*, August 1969, pp. 21–22. Ecumenical Press Service, 'Speakers heckled at WCC Race Conference', No. 18, 22 May 1969, pp. 2–3. Mason, Interviewed by the author. Frost, Interviewed by the author.

812 THP, 371, Text of the Bishop of Stepney's Speech to the World Council of Churches' Consultation on Racism, Church House Westminster: 21 May 1969.

whites fail to act, the hearts of African people would be permanently turned against them.⁸¹³

Tambo and Huddleston's speeches reflected the major themes of the economics of white racism and the necessity of Black Power in order to fight against it, as well as strong indictments of Christianity. These themes were coupled with, on Huddleston's part, fears of the end of Christianity because of a long history of Christian oppression in Africa and elsewhere, and the prior refusal of white Christians to grapple with these issues in a way which led to demonstrable action. However, it would be misleading to think that these were the only sentiments expressed during the Consultation. Rather, the Consultation itself reflected a meeting point between these emergent and urgent voices for change, and, especially in respect of sustained white *English* involvement, more traditional liberal and paternalist concepts of 'race relations', as well as pronounced advancements of the myth of tolerance.

Roy Sawh and Archbishop Ramsey: Integration and the Myth of Tolerance

Owing to the reorientation away from 'race relations' towards the centrality of white racism by many of the participants of the Consultation, discussions on integration, usually the hallmark of 'race relations' dialogue, were scant indeed. Moreover, when reference was made to the concept, it tended to be fiercely critical. However, despite this *overall* emphasis, there was still some positive discussion of integration on the part of the white British elites. In fact, the two sections of the Consultation which dealt specifically with Britain were entitled 'Racialism in the United Kingdom: Towards Integration'. Given that integration was clearly an outmoded concept by that time, it is possible to view this adherence to it as related to the myth of tolerance and a denial of facing British and English forms of racism. To this end, as we shall see below, two of the white British speakers were criticised for exuding an air of smugness and self-righteousness. This perhaps indicated their paternalistic belief in the allegedly 'better' state of British 'race relations' *vis-à-vis* the American situation.⁸¹⁴

813 THP, 371, Text of the Bishop of Stepney's Speech to the World Council of Churches' Consultation on Racism, Church House Westminster: 21 May 1969. As was mentioned in n. 189, Huddleston was fearful of losing the 'soul of Africa' to Islam or Communism because of the churches failure to *act* against injustice.

814 The first session on the evening of 20 May was a round table discussion chaired by David Mason with the following panellists: Nadine Peppard, Roy Sawh, Douglas Tilbe, and Lena Townsend, with David Pitt as the 'resource person'. The second, on the morning of 21 May,

A good example of this was Kenneth Little's speech on 19 May which saw him root his point of view in the inherent positivity of assimilation-integration by condemning outright all forms of racialised identities. Unlike the majority of the speakers at the Consultation, Little's speech was rooted in integration as a positive social ideal. Furthermore, and in contrast to the tone of Uppsala and the Consultation overall, in his speech he claimed that racism was a modern phenomenon, was not the root cause of the transatlantic slave trade, nor was it present during colonialism. Rather, Little declared that racism emerged after, and because of, emancipation. Rather than declare 'race' a social construct, Little instead sought to retain its use in professional scientific classificatory circumstances, such in the cases of biologists and anthropologists, in order to describe the distinct 'breeding communities' which comprised human diversity. However, at the same time, Little also argued strongly against any cultural constructions of 'race' or 'ethnicity', in particular the concept of *négritude*.⁸¹⁵ Little viewed racism as a way of providing reassurance to a person 'without apparent jeopardy to his moral or intellectual position'. With this in mind, he considered the marriage of 'cultural attributes with racial differences' and 'the assertion that a person should take special pride in being black' as being 'racist by implication'. He defended his argument by stating that white supremacists argued along similar lines of 'cultural variation' and that he feared (perhaps justifiably) that eventually 'cultural differences will be construed as racial, and hence as hereditary'. For Little then, 'race' existed as a 'neutral' scientific fact, but should not be advanced as a positive (or negative) cultural or social trait. In making this kind of argument, he seriously misjudged, or was generally not in line with, the overall mood of the Consultation and was therefore subject to fierce criticism.⁸¹⁶

The speech of Lena Townsend, who was a member of the Race Relations

featured two addresses by Mark Bonham-Carter and Merlyn Rees. Douglas Tilbe was a Quaker who had long been active in 'race relations' and eventually became the first head of the BCC's CRRU. WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. Lewis Donnelly, 'Report from Notting Hill', *Tablet*, 31 May 1969, p. 21. Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 4.

815 The philosophy of *négritude* entailed the construction of a common, world-wide black identity. Aimé Césaire is probably the most famous proponent.

816 WCC, 4223.1.02, Kenneth Little, Some Notes on the Nature of Racism, Document No. 12/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969. LPA, Ramsey 174, ff. 88. Unfortunately the nature of the criticisms are not recorded.

Board and the Conservative leader of the ILEA, was called 'the best racist presentation given' by Roger Harless.⁸¹⁷ As was typical of sociological reports regarding 'race' and 'immigration' in Britain, Townsend's speech entitled 'The Struggle for Integration' was a mass of dehumanising figures and statistics, wherein she talked about 'immigrant children' as if they were units or items rather than real human beings.⁸¹⁸ Furthermore, Townsend claimed that there was no racism in Notting Hill schools, even during the white violence, which does not, as we have seen in earlier chapters, even remotely tally with reports from people living and working in the area, including the reports of the Team Ministry.⁸¹⁹ As such, like Little, she was criticised for giving a racist presentation which 'put immigrants into special categories and saw them as culturally deprived'.⁸²⁰ As Roger Harless asked, was not categorising people in this way 'a legacy of earlier definitions of savage?'.⁸²¹

It is worth noting another controversy which occurred during the Consultation involving Archbishop Ramsey. Despite attempting to avoid controversy by declining to speak on the same platform as Oliver Tambo, the Archbishop was to find himself heavily criticised because of his treatment of the activist Roy Sawh. The incident is representative of the 'mood of paternalism' which was criticised in the final report of the Consultation and which was also displayed in the speeches of Little and Townsend. On the morning of Wednesday 21 May, Merlyn Rees, a Labour MP for Leeds South (then Under-Secretary for Home Affairs and the future Home Secretary), had given a paper entitled 'Government Assistance for Urban Areas with Special Social Needs' during one of the UK panels. Accordingly, Rees' speech extolled 'the virtues of British Institutions and enlightened practices in the area of race relations'.⁸²² It was reported that the

817 WCC, 4223.1.02, Roger A. Harless, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

818 As Ian Thompson rightly observed, defining, categorising and counting things has been a part of how the West has historically controlled things from political movements, to data, to concepts. Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 5. See also: Jenkins, *The Production of Knowledge*.

819 WCC, 4223.1.02, Lena Townsend, The Struggle for Integration (Conciliation and Education), Document No. 13/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

820 Campbell Page, 'The Church cries revolution', *Guardian*, 26 May 1969, p. 9.

821 WCC, 4223.1.02, Roger A. Harless, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

822 Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 4.

smug and self-righteous tone of the British speakers during this panel (the other was Mark Bonham-Carter) had caused a significant amount of resentment amongst many members of the Consultation.⁸²³ Indeed, a British Roman Catholic observer-participant reported that Merlyn Rees' 'bankrupt failure to answer questions on our immigration policy left the delegates suspicious and alarmed'.⁸²⁴

Sawh requested the opportunity to challenge Rees after lunch, and despite being given permission to do so, Rees in fact left immediately after his speech without giving Sawh the promised opportunity. This obviously frustrated Sawh and, rather than *listen* to Sawh complain about this injustice, Ramsey instead told Sawh 'to sit down and be quiet "as we have to get on with the agenda"'.⁸²⁵ To which Sawh is variously reported as saying, 'We are suffering, but you always run things your bloody way!', and 'So much for your pretty English liberal sentiments' as he too left the room, although not before receiving an apology from Senator McGovern.⁸²⁶

Many delegates present were said to have criticised Ramsey at this juncture for not letting Sawh speak; in particular, both Channing Phillips and Eddie Brown were said to have been particularly vocal. Phillips called the episode horrifying and humiliating for Sawh, not because the confrontation had taken place, but because they 'continued the same Christian platitudinous drivel' afterwards. In turn, Brown was outraged by the insensitivity that Ramsey had displayed.⁸²⁷ Fr. James Groppi also took the opportunity to criticise Ramsey later that morning and opened his speech by saying,

This morning I think that we have an example of what the Church should not do in its relationship to oppressed people. The Archbishop made a terrible mistake in not letting Mr. Sawh speak. This has been the attitude of the Church throughout its history in relation to suffering people. It has refused to listen to those who are ostracized and to those who are suffering. No individual who is white will ever know what it is to be black either in Great Britain or in America, and so I would begin my remarks by saying that if there is anything that the Church must do in the future it is *to*

823 Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 4.

824 Lewis Donnelly, 'Report from Notting Hill', *Tablet*, 31 May 1969, pp. 21–22, quote from p. 22.

825 Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 4.

826 *Ibid.*, p. 4. 'Dr Ramsey in Black Power Clash', *The Times*, 22 May 1969, p. 3.

827 'Dr Ramsey in Black Power Clash', *The Times*, 22 May 1969, p. 3.

listen.⁸²⁸

Later that morning, Ramsey did make an apology, saying that he now realised that people had wanted to hear more of Sawh (although clearly 'people' did not include himself). Despite this apology, Ramsey's private papers show him unrepentant of the situation: he called it 'trivial' and claimed he was simply trying to conduct business in an orderly fashion.⁸²⁹ As we have seen in previous chapters, Ramsey was not keen to make waves and his liberalism leaned towards attempts at pacification which tended to appease only those who shared his opinion. Placed in a truly ecumenical environment with wide-ranging viewpoints spoken with passion, urgency, and force, Ramsey found himself out of his depth. And, as with the other white British elites, found himself speaking from a place that many of the other participants had left behind. For, as *The Methodist Recorder* noted in a report on the Consultation, 'Integration is not enough to resolve racial conflict. The disease has to be dug out from the root'.⁸³⁰

In contrast to the ways British elites positively engaged with the concept of 'integration' was the position of American Christians and activists, black British activists, and an unidentified but particularly astute African. Nathan Hare, who at the time was chairman of the first Department of Black Studies which he founded at San Francisco State University, spoke forcefully against concepts of assimilation *and* integration (although integration was largely used in his speech in the assimilationist form). Hare saw both concepts as attempts to superimpose the white experience onto the black experience.⁸³¹ Importantly, studies of the social mobility of black Americans indicated that any attempts to integrate had largely failed (outwith tokenistic exceptions) due to the persistence of colour discrimination.⁸³² As Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton had put it two years earlier,

in order to be accepted [...] the black man must strive to become 'white'.

828 WCC, 4223.1.02, James Groppi, The Role of the Churches and the World Council of Churches in the Elimination of Racism, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969, *emphasis mine*.

829 LPA, Ramsey 174, ff. 84, 92.

830 'For revolution, read resistance', *Methodist Recorder*, 15 May 1969, p. 1.

831 Daisuke Kitagawa also made this point in his speech. WCC, 4223.1.02, Daisuke Kitagawa, Black Power, White Racism and the Church: USA, 1968, Document No. 7/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

832 WCC, 4223.1.02, Nathan Hare, The Struggle to Eradicate Racism and the New American Dilemma, Document No. 4/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

To the extent that he does, he is considered 'well adjusted' – one who has 'risen above the race question'. These people are frequently held up by the white Establishment as living examples of the progress being made by the society in solving the race problem. Suffice it to say that precisely because they are required to denounce – overtly or covertly – their black race, *they are reinforcing racism in this country*.⁸³³

Integration was then, a charade; or, as Gayraud S. Wilmore, Jr. parsed it, integration was a one-way street whereby people must give up all things black in order to enter white society.⁸³⁴ In this way Kitagawa was right to say that 'Black Americans are no longer seeking "integration" but striving for a genuinely pluralistic America, even at the risk of self-separatism'.⁸³⁵

The most clear and concise dismissal of integration was in fact made by an unidentified African delegate, and it was repeated in a concluding note in the reparations section of the final report. With clarity, this unidentified delegate pointed to the obfuscation which debates on integration generated. They asked if advocating policies of integration or separation were in fact matters of political expediency, rather than tactics to solve racism. They suggested it was inevitable that a numerically dominant group (e.g. white people in the UK or the USA, or black people in Africa) would favour integration policies (which was again understood as assimilation) as this would guarantee that they maintained political advantage because of their numerical advantage. Further, the speaker asked, was it not also the case that minority groups (e.g. black people in the UK and USA, or white people in Southern Africa) would advocate separation (or segregation) in order to preserve their cultural identity. Asserting that this was so, the speaker then pointed out the tendentious nature of seeking moral or theological justifications for integration and segregation and warned the Consultation against once more being consumed by sterile debates on this issue. The speaker therefore suggested that the debate instead be moved to considerations of power – scientific, economic, and political – and its unjust

833 Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967, repr. 1969), pp. 46–47, *emphasis theirs*. Whilst talking in an American context, Carmichael and Hamilton's formulation is relevant for two reasons: their influence in the UK and the fact that many of the speakers at the Consultation were Americans.

834 WCC, 4223.1.02, Gayraud S. Wilmore, Jr., The Case for a New Black Church Style, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

835 WCC, 4223.1.02, Daisuke Kitagawa, Black Power, White Racism and the Church: USA, 1968, Document No. 7/E, World Council of Churches, Consultation on Racism, 19-24 May 1969.

distribution in the world.⁸³⁶

Whoever introduced this point of view to the Consultation – and it was most likely Oliver Tambo – certainly changed the tenor of the WCC's approach to the notion of integration.⁸³⁷ Indeed, the final report said,

A new guiding concept should do equal justice to the elements of legitimate pluralism and sufficient community or consensus. It should take into account both 'racial identity' and our common humanity. It should suggest a relation of genuine mutuality without paternalism of any kind.⁸³⁸

The document also noted that many terms had been suggested for this new concept: pluralism, multi-racialism, and co-relation. Pluralism was first introduced to a British audience by Roy Jenkins in 1966 and it is clear that, as we go into the seventies and eighties, pluralism or multiculturalism, became the predominant social ideal in respect of 'race relations' as a way of honouring a multiplicity of racialised identities seeking to maintain their own integrity and self-respect. Indeed, pluralism was the ideal put forward by black British activists such as Roy Sawh at this time. What this Consultation shows then is the fracturing of older Christian universalist and integrationist philosophies in a global sense, but also, the slowness of British elites in coming to terms with the changed terrain.

Revolution and Reparations: A Change in Christian Consciousness and Practise

One of the most significant aspects of the Notting Hill Consultation, however, was not that Christians were simply discussing ideas of Black Power and white racism, but that the Consultation itself was interrupted by a group of black Americans who read a Declaration of Revolution to the attendees. More, the

836 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 6. Also reported in: Vincent, *The Race Race*, p. 43.

837 Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 6. This nameless delegate is reported by Thompson as stunning the audience and changing the tenor and direction of the Consultation by their speech. It is unclear who this delegate was, but it is likely to have been Oliver Tambo given his prior writings, although the other possible candidate is Revd H.P. Chikomo of Rhodesia. One suspects that the delegate was not named in the article as it was published in a South African Christian journal which was critical of the apartheid regime; the journal was eventually banned in 1977. See: Ian Macqueen, 'Students, Apartheid and the Ecumenical Movement in South Africa, 1960–1975', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 39 (2013), 447–463 (p. 453).

838 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

way the Consultation responded to the Declaration, and the long-term legacy of the response, changed the ways in which the WCC involved itself in anti-racist activity for several decades to come in terms of the establishment of the PCR and the Special Fund (see below).

Before continuing onto the Declaration read at the Consultation, one should note that this was not the first time black activists had interrupted a church meeting in order to read a revolutionary statement. The SNCC (and later Black Panther) activist James Forman had disrupted a communion service at Riverside church in New York City on 4 May 1969 in order to read his 'Manifesto to the White Christian Churches and the Jewish Synagogues in the United States of America and all other Racist Institutions'.⁸³⁹ The Manifesto was originally presented at the National Black Economic Development Conference in Detroit, MI on 16 April 1969 and demanded \$500,000,000 in reparations; a figure, the document stated, which represented 'fifteen dollars per nigger', but which was also only the beginning of what was due.⁸⁴⁰ As Elaine Lehtreck has noted, 'The Black Manifesto can be understood as an expression of rebellion rooted in the despair of a people who had given up hope of "integration" into the mainstream socio-economic systems and structures in the United States'.⁸⁴¹

839 Riverside Church has had an important history in respect of the Civil Rights movement in the USA with people such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Desmond Tutu, and Nelson Mandela all addressing the congregation. As well as Riverside church, white and black students also occupied the administration building of Union Theological Seminary in support of the Manifesto, and further disruptions occurred in NYC, New Orleans, and other US cities, as well as in Paris, France. Eventually, Riverside church got a restraining order against Forman which he burnt on the steps of the chancery office of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York. In fact, groups supporting Forman's manifesto continued to stage sit-ins in the US whilst the WCC conference was happening in the UK. WCC, 4223.1.03, Ecumenical Press Service, 'Sit-Ins Bring Home Black Manifesto Demands to U.S. Denominations', No. 19, 29 May 1969. Michael Knipe, 'Negroes Invade Churches', *The Times*, 13 May 1969, p. 6. Edward B. Fiske, 'Religion: Now a Challenge to the Church From the Blacks', *New York Times*, 18 May 1969, p. 18. George Dugan, 'Forman Stands, Silent, Through Riverside Church Sermon', *New York Times*, 12 May 1969, p. 37. 'Militants Invade a Church in Paris: Demand \$5,000 at Once to Go to Forman's Fund', *New York Times*, 12 May 1969, p. 38. Edward B. Fiske, 'The Vulnerable Churches: Black Militant Demand for Reparations Is Posing Painful Questions for Clerics', *New York Times*, 7 May 1969, p. 27. Vincent, *The Race Race*, p. 55. For more on Riverside Church see: Peter J. Paris, *et. al.*, *The History of the Riverside Church in the City of New York* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 2004).

840 This figure is repeated throughout the document as a rhetorical device to underscore how little was being asked when applied across the entire African-American population. WCC, 4223.1.02, James Forman, Manifesto to the White Christian Churches and the Jewish Synagogues in the United States of America and all other Racist Institutions.

841 Elaine Allen Lehtreck, "'We Are Demanding \$500 Million For Reparations': The Black Manifesto, Mainline Religious Denominations, and Black Economic Development", *The Journal of African American History*, 97 (2012), 39–71 (p. 40). See this article for a study of the Manifesto and its ramifications.

The Declaration of Revolution which was read out on the afternoon of Friday 23 May 1969 in Notting Hill was therefore not without precedent, but it was nonetheless transformative. The four activists, led by George Black from SNCC and accompanied by Nathan Hare, politely took the microphone from Miss Fairfax who was presenting the report of Working Group Three and proceeded to read the Declaration. As with Forman's Manifesto, and as with many of the other speeches heard during the Consultation, the Declaration emphasised the role of the churches in slavery and other racist practises, acts, and institutions. Furthermore, it highlighted the hypocrisy of the churches preaching 'blessed be the poor' and non-violence when they amassed billions of dollars and had a legacy of violence against non-white people. He said, 'We are tired of a religion in which the greatest black Christians are martyrs and saints, [and] the greatest white Christians the imperialist conquistadores and administrators who put them to death'.⁸⁴²

This particular criticism was one of the lines of argument that the WCC took seriously (another was the financial demands as shall be shown below). As such, the final report of the Consultation was to note that the churches' teaching of 'turning the other cheek' and of non-resistance was hypocritical in light of the fact that the churches also often tolerated institutional and personal racism. Further, the report stated that, as well as lacking in challenges to racism and racists, this teaching also perpetuated racism by encouraging the oppressed to acquiesce to their situation in life. It was these aspects of Christianity, the report noted, which had caused many in liberation movements to eschew Christianity. The report also drew attention to the traditional Christian point of view which was to see an insistence on sacrifice as an integral part of Christian life. However, and of much importance, whilst the theology of the sacrifice of Jesus which underpinned this standpoint was acknowledged, the report also noted the difference between Jesus' *voluntary* sacrifice which informed the sacrifice of all Christians, and the *involuntary* nature of oppression. As such, the report emphasised that the fellowship of Christ's sufferings could not and should not be used as a justification or rationale for oppression. Moreover, the report stated that Christians should resist the temptation to continue theologising about

842 WCC, 4223.1.02, Declaration of Revolution, n.d., c. 23 May 1969. 'Black Power group halts Church talks', *The Times*, 24 May 1969, p. 1. Campbell Page, 'The Church cries revolution', *Guardian*, 26 May 1969, p. 9. Vincent, *The Race Race*, p. 44.

oppression and must compel themselves to fight harder in action.⁸⁴³

Forman's Manifesto had contained examples of how they planned to invest the demanded money: black owned TV networks and publishing houses, the establishment of a National Black Labour Strike and Defence fund, and an International Black Appeal to fund black cooperatives in the USA and Africa, for example.⁸⁴⁴ Similarly, George Black's Declaration entailed a list of financial demands and this time with a strong emphasis on internationalist solidarity: £5,000,000 defence fund for black political prisoners; £5,000,000 each for various liberation movements including PAIGC (Guinea), FRELIMO (Mozambique), ZAPU-ANC (Zimbabwe/Rhodesia), and FALN (Venezuela); and £20,000,000 for an international publishing house to record the struggles of oppressed people all over the world. Further, Black demanded that the WCC should publicise all financial assets that it, and member churches, held *and* 'draw up a legal document stating the terms of the above payments, such statement to be presented to an appointed delegate at 11.00 AM, Saturday, May 24, 1969'.⁸⁴⁵

After the demands had been read, Ian Thompson reported that 'The consultation broke up in chaos and confusion for a couple of hours as delegates indulged in a great deal of breast-beating and a virtual paroxysm of despair and self-accusing guilt'.⁸⁴⁶ However, as with Forman's Manifesto read at Riverside Church, the WCC did not reject Black's Declaration outright and eventually a sub-committee was appointed by Eugene Carson Blake who insisted that the committee members stay up until 4am if necessary in order to draft a reply.⁸⁴⁷ Wilfred Wood, 'the rebel Bishop', tabled a motion to accept the demands made in the Declaration, however his motion was ignored by the acting chairman, Chandran Devanesan. Other black activists present, such as Roy Sawh, suggested that accepting the *principle* of reparations and radical change would

843 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

844 WCC, 4223.1.02, James Forman, Manifesto to the White Christian Churches and the Jewish Synagogues in the United States of America and all other Racist Institutions.

845 WCC, 4223.1.02, Declaration of Revolution, n.d., c. 23 May 1969.

846 Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 5.

847 Lechtreck, "'We Are Demanding \$500 Million For Reparations'", p. 46. Thompson, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', p. 5. Campbell Page, 'The Church cries revolution', *Guardian*, 26 May 1969, p. 9.

be enough, rather than engaging with the specific demands of the Declaration.⁸⁴⁸

The response given to authors of the Declaration was exceedingly respectful and in drafting it, the Consultation forfeited the time to complete the discussions of the Consultation, which indicates how seriously they took their reply.⁸⁴⁹ It opened by thanking the activists for the courteous manner in which George Black had asked to be heard and went on to say that, 'Your confrontation may indeed have brought us closer to the full reality of the problems with which we have been grappling all week'. The response also noted that even prior to hearing the Declaration, it had been decided to include *reference* to reparations, moral and financial, in the Consultation report. Although, not, it should be noted, any commitment to *giving* financial reparations or *acting* in solidarity as a corporate body *at this time*. Instead, it passed the responsibility for implementing the demands of the Declaration onto local churches and national councils of churches.⁸⁵⁰ Despite the fact that the response was yet more words, a *Telegraph* editorial dismissed it as being 'couched in the clichés of student radicalism' and as contributing to the division of the church since, 'Anglicans will not wish to see themselves "represented" in, or their Archbishop gracing the meetings of, a body which seems bent on capturing official Christianity for the support of the Black Power movement'.⁸⁵¹ In the latter sentiment, they were not at all wrong.

There are two reasons to suppose that George Black did not anticipate a favourable response from the WCC members present. Firstly, whilst it is not known if he or his associates produced it, an arresting document was circulated entitled 'The International Zoo: Or How American Dogs Bark for French Pigs'. The document referred to 'The recent arrest of six young American students by the French gestapo in an interesting reversal in international imperialist strategy. Normally the local exploiters call in the yankee dogs when people show signs of

848 Wood was affectionately called 'the rebel Bishop' by Sivanandan: Sivanandan and Bourne, Interviewed by the author. Vincent, *The Race Race*, pp. 44–45.

849 WCC, 4223.1.03, William Crane, From the Politics of Consultation to those of Confrontation: The 1969 WCC Consultation on Racism on the perspective of the historic ecumenical concern for race relations, n.d., c. 1969.

850 WCC, 4223.1.02, Statement in Response to the Declaration or [sic] Revolution Read to the Consultation on Racism Called by the World Council of Churches, 24 May 1969.

851 LPA, Ramsey 174, ff. 90.

revolt'. The document stated that Revd Emerson Hangen (of the American Church in Paris) and Lloyd DeLamater (the president of the American University in Paris) had called the police because a group of students wanted to 'forcibly oppose' some SNCC activists; and 'instead of arresting those fascist thugs, they ripped off the friends of SNCC'.⁸⁵² The document ended by saying,

The attack against the American Church in Paris is not original. 2000 years ago Jesus whipped money-changers in the temple. Today's religious money-changers deal in billions of dollars.

– YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE JESUS TO WANT TO WHIP THESE 'CHRISTIANS' ASSES –

– YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE A CHRISTIAN TO WANT TO STOP 'CHRISTIAN' EXPLOITATION –

YOU don't have to be a Christian to come to the Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre this Saturday where the World Council of Churches will be discussing 'racialism'. Come at 11.00AM and see how white Christians react to black demands. Come and see them say NO to the black ultimatum demanding economic, political and human equality.⁸⁵³

Clearly then, a positive response was not anticipated. A second reason was related to Forman's experiences in the US in respect of his Manifesto. Whilst the New York City-based Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO) initially declared an intention to back the Manifesto, this quickly split the organisation. For, whilst the Christian executive director, Revd Lucius Walker, was supportive, the Jewish president Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum rejected the demands of the Manifesto as racist. This split caused the American Jewish Committee to eventually leave the organisation.⁸⁵⁴ As such, although prefaced

852 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. 4223.1.01, Blue Document: The International Zoo: Or How American Dogs Bark for French Pigs, n.d., c. May 1969. It is unclear what incident the document is referring to, but it could be referencing a 11 May 1969 incident in the American Church in Paris whereby two African-American women read out Forman's manifesto. No arrests are mentioned in the report however. Reference to the arrest of the American students at the American Church in Paris was also made in George Black's response to the WCC's response to his Declaration on the morning of 24 May 1969. See: 'Militants Invade a Church in Paris: Demand \$5,000 at Once to Go to Forman's Fund', *New York Times*, 12 May 1969, p. 38.

853 WCC, 4223.1.01, Blue Document: The International Zoo: Or How American Dogs Bark for French Pigs, n.d., c. May 1969.

854 Edward B. Fiske, 'The Vulnerable Churches: Black Militant Demand for Reparations Is Posing Painful Questions for Clerics', *New York Times*, 7 May 1969, p. 27. Michael Knipe, 'Negroes Invade Churches', *The Times*, 13 May 1969, p. 6. Douglas Martin, 'Lucius Walker, Baptist Pastor for Peace, Dies at 80', *New York Times*, 12 September 2010, p. 32. IFCO was set up by liberal Christians to deal with community organisation projects which were seen as being too radical to be able to be handled by individual denominations; it continues

with what appears to be a spontaneous preamble, George Black read out a pre-written response which did not fully address the statement given by the WCC and which was predicated more on a certainty of outright rejection.⁸⁵⁵

Black, just as many other activists then and now, was tired of discussion and opened his speech by informing the delegates that they were 'beyond the stage where we can have productive dialogue. It should have been clear from what I said that what we are interested in, more than anything, is action'.⁸⁵⁶ As such, Black (if he was behind the aforementioned document) was right in some ways to assume that the WCC would say no to his demands as their response clearly divested them of responsibility to act. Before going on to read his pre-written statement, he also informed the Consultation that in respect of reparations, 'we are not interested in your *charity*. We are interested in changing, in destroying the economic relations, the relations of power that create these needs, that define and maintain these needs'.⁸⁵⁷ In this way, the giving of money, whether as aid or as reparations was not enough unless the economic structures that maintained inequalities were also demolished.⁸⁵⁸

As is to be expected, Black's response was damning of the church. He said of Forman's Riverside activism that,

it signalled the beginning of the revolutionary process by which the western religious establishment will be exposed, not simply as irrelevant, as the most radical of your churchmen now claim, but as dangerous and harmful to the economic and political existence of oppressed people the world over.⁸⁵⁹

In underscoring this point, Black made reference to the fact that Christians expected non-violent resistance from the oppressed in the face of violent oppression. He noted that Christians claimed that 'you support our struggle,

to this day: IFCO / Pastors for Peace, <<http://ifconews.org>> [accessed 15 September 2016].

855 Vincent, *The Race Race*, p. 45.

856 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969, emphasis theirs.

857 *Ibid.*, *emphasis mine*.

858 This was also the position of the Haslemere Committee which issued its Declaration in 1968. The Haslemere Committee comprised of a group of people, many of whom were Christians, who worked for organisations such as Oxfam, the Catholic Institute for International Relations, Student Christian Movement, Christian Aid and others. It included amongst its signatories the Notting Hill Methodist Church member Stephen Duckworth. See: The Haslemere Committee, *The Haslemere Declaration*.

859 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

then you give us Christian platitudes to fight guns, and tanks and planes'.⁸⁶⁰ Furthermore, he also stated that endorsing the demands of the Declaration in principle but not in practise would make the church a liar, 'because all our principles must lead to action, revolutionary action'. Ending with a warning he said, 'we shall have our freedom or your Christian society, your Christian banks, your Christian factories, your Christian universities, and your fine Christian churches shall be levelled for it'.⁸⁶¹

Elaine Lehtreck has suggested that Forman's Manifesto 'may have saved the churches from becoming irrelevant'.⁸⁶² This is an interesting suggestion and related to it is that without Black's Notting Hill intervention, it is unlikely that the WCC would have structured their lines of action post-Consultation along the avenues and principles they did. Black's Declaration forced the WCC to think deeply about the reality of anti-racist *action* and the practicalities of reparations: what they would look like in practise over a moral or ethical assent to them in theory. As such, the final report of the Notting Hill Consultation which was presented to the Central Committee at a meeting in Canterbury in August 1969 was unafraid to point out the failings of the world churches and the Consultation. For instance, the report noted how the Consultation itself had been exposed to racism in various forms and in this, the report stated that the church was *reflecting* rather than *leading* the world, something the world churches were keen to see change.⁸⁶³ Furthermore, the report acknowledged that 'The identification of the churches with the status quo means today, as before, that it has remained, in effect, part of the racial problem and not a means of eliminating it'.⁸⁶⁴

Unlike the earlier UNESCO definition used at Uppsala, the WCC now defined racism as 'an outgrowth of the struggle for power that afflicts all men. Racist ideologies and propaganda are developed and disseminated as tools in

860 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

861 *Ibid.*

862 Lehtreck, "'We Are Demanding \$500 Million For Reparations', p. 39.

863 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

864 *Ibid.*, emphasis theirs.

economic, political and military struggles for power'.⁸⁶⁵ Racism was also a manifestation of man's sin, and as such must be *eradicated*. The report also acknowledged that whilst racism existed the world over, it was the particular confluence of economic power and racism in white dominated countries which made white racism so destructive, and so urgently in need of eradication.⁸⁶⁶ As such, no individual Christian approach to racism would ever suffice: the entire community of churches and Christians must be committed to fighting and eradicating racism.⁸⁶⁷ Strikingly they said that 'Our struggle is not against flesh and blood. It is against the principalities, against the powers of evil, against the deeply entrenched demonic forces of racial prejudice and hatred that we must battle. Ours is a task of exorcism'.⁸⁶⁸ With this statement, the WCC was admitting that the Christian church *embodied, hosted, and manifested* racism and must seek to banish it from the very crucible of the church body.

With the shift to a corporate emphasis on *eradicating* racism came specific pronouncements and plans of action for both the WCC and the member churches on institutional levels. Predictably many recommended plans of action were educationally orientated, but alongside this was a list of concrete actions designed to have specific economic impacts. They were: recommendations to use economic sanctions against organisations and corporations which practised racism and to exert influence over governments to do the same; an affirmation of the principle of reparations to exploited peoples and countries in order to produce a more favourable balance of economic power, alongside a recognition of the churches involvement in said exploitation; and the establishment of a properly funded unit to deal with the eradication of racism.⁸⁶⁹ Finally, and most significantly, 'that all else failing, *the Church and churches support resistance*

865 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

866 The PCR continued to focus on white racism until the early 1990s, at which point, as a result of the ending of apartheid in Southern Africa, it turned more to issues pertaining to indigenous communities in South America and Dalits in India. Claude E. Welch, Jr., 'Mobilizing Morality: The World Council of Churches and Its Program to Combat Racism, 1969-1994', *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23 (2001), 863-910 (p. 866).

867 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

868 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Central Committee, An Ecumenical Programme to Combat Racism, Document No. 71, 21 August 1969.

869 UNESCO, Statement on Race and Racial Prejudice.

movements, including revolutions, which are aimed at the elimination of political or economic tyranny which makes racism possible'.⁸⁷⁰ Moreover, this support was to be economic as well as moral and the member churches were urged to 'divest themselves of their excessive material wealth by immediately allocating a significant portion of their total resources, *without employing any mechanisms of control*, to organizations of the racially oppressed'.⁸⁷¹ What can be taken from this is that they now understood that it was time to move beyond charity, 'and to become agents for the radical reconstruction of society. There can be no justice in our world without a transfer of economic resources to undergird the redistribution of political power and to make cultural self-determination meaningful'.⁸⁷²

This decision led to the most significant outcome of the Notting Hill Consultation: the establishment of the PCR and the Special Fund. To this end, the Canterbury Committee's report set out a five year plan for the PCR which was mainly uncontroversial and educational and research-oriented in nature. It involved setting up teams to research the best lines of action for particular areas and churches in the world, so that they could determine the best political actions to eradicate racism. However, there was a further aspect to the PCR: the establishment of the Special Fund to Combat Racism. This funding body was a consequence of their commitment to *financially* support racially oppressed groups as a method of action. Significantly, the WCC included revolutionary organisations within their potential remit of applicants, and, as is to be expected, this decision was to prove highly provocative to many white Christians, churches, and members of the press, particularly in England.⁸⁷³

As Elizabeth Adler has noted, 'The Special Fund was only one part of the PCR operations, but it soon became the focal point'.⁸⁷⁴ Never before had an action of the ecumenical movement received such attention from the secular press, the churches, and the world more generally.⁸⁷⁵ Given the essentially uncontroversial

870 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969, *emphasis mine*.

871 *Ibid.*, *emphasis mine*.

872 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Central Committee, An Ecumenical Programme to Combat Racism, Document No. 71, 21 August 1969.

873 *Ibid.*

874 Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 15.

875 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

educational and research-oriented nature of the PCR more generally, the Special Fund was quite clearly the primary reason for the attention and criticisms levelled at the Programme overall. In fact, Bishop Kenneth Sansbury's 1975 booklet *Combatting Racism: The British Churches and the WCC Programme to Combat Racism* discussed the criticisms of the PCR almost entirely in reference to the Special Fund and the grants to liberation movements.⁸⁷⁶ For reasons of space, it is not possible here to give a full analysis of the PCR, but below there is a brief outline of the Special Fund and the criticisms levelled at it by British churches and Christians.⁸⁷⁷

The Special Fund was set up to give grants to 'organizations of oppressed racial groups or organizations supporting victims of racial injustice whose purposes are not inconsonant with the general purposes of the World Council [...] to be used in their struggle for economic, social and political justice'.⁸⁷⁸ Furthermore, the grants were to be given to groups and organisations which *combatted* racism, rather than to welfare organisations which sought to alleviate the *effects* of racism. This was because the latter were eligible for numerous other grants, but the former not necessarily so. The heart of the controversy, therefore, was that some of the organisations funded by the PCR engaged in violence as a part of their liberation efforts. Whilst on the one hand the organisations receiving the grants had made promises that the money would not be used for military purposes, on the other hand, the grants were also given without any restrictions on use.⁸⁷⁹ To this end, the WCC said,

876 The furore over the Special Fund saw Sansbury note that even though the PCR only constituted a meagre 4% of the WCC's budget, many people thought that the WCC existed purely to administer it. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 10. Likewise, writing in respect of a 1978 grant to the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe, Pradip Ninan Thomas noted that in the process of reporting on the PCR grant, 'the World Council was reduced to PCR, PCR to the Special Fund and the Special Fund to a particular grant made from it. The WCC image that is mediated is that of an organization involved in radical political action'. Pradip Ninan Thomas, 'Media Reportage of the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism: A study of how the British press reported on the grant given in 1978 by the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism to the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe' (unpublished master's dissertation, University of Leicester, 1983), p. 62.

877 For more information on the PCR see: Adler, *A Small Beginning*. Welch, Jr., 'Mobilizing Morality'.

878 WCC, 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Central Committee, An Ecumenical Programme to Combat Racism, Document No. 71, 21 August 1969..

879 Although, as a Church of England report pointed out, the size of the grants 'was insufficient to be of real military value even had they been misused'. WCC, 4223.13.17, Edwin Barker, Board for Social Responsibility, Report on Civil Strife, Second Draft, 23 March 1971. 'World Council's Anti-Racism Gifts Spark World-Wide Debate', *Sunday*, 5 (1970), 10–12. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 31. Adler, *A Small Beginning*, pp. 16–19.

The churches must always stand for the liberation of the oppressed and of victims of violent measures which deny basic human rights. It calls attention to the fact that violence is in many cases inherent in the maintenance of the status quo. Nevertheless, the WCC does not and cannot identify itself with any political movement, nor does it pass judgement on those victims of racism who are driven to violence as the only way left to them to redress grievances and so open the way for a new and more just order.⁸⁸⁰

The grants were then an act of solidarity with a changed world, a world which had grown tired of waiting. As such, the Special Fund signified that Christian fellowship was now to be extended to 'those who believe that the only way left to them to end the violence which represses them is through the violence of revolution'.⁸⁸¹ And as a reminder to the PCR's mainly western European critics, Baldwin Sjollema also pointed out that European Christians themselves had recently resisted foreign domination with violence during WW2.⁸⁸²

Alongside the important shift in respect of the *types* of groups chosen to receive funding, another important aspect of the the Special Fund was the way in which the grants were given. The fact that they were given without restrictions on use was intended to signify that the underlying concept of the Special Fund was a transfer of power by the powerful to the powerless.⁸⁸³ In this way, the awarding of a grant was not intended as an endorsement of the *tactics* of an organisation, rather as a symbol of support of the *overall aims* of an organisation in securing its own liberation for itself and its people. As Adler noted, 'The grants to liberation movements were a (small) step across the line which has been drawn between *charity*, traditionally regarded as Christian, and *solidarity* which has seldom be risked by the churches'.⁸⁸⁴ Therefore, even though the amounts of the grants were not necessarily particularly high, the importance of the awarding of a grant was the moral and political support it symbolised.⁸⁸⁵

The PCR was initially funded by \$200,000 from WCC reserves and an appeal

880 WCC Addis Ababa Minutes as cited in, Adler, *A Small Beginning*, pp. 16–19.

881 WCC, 4223.17.1, A Short Description of the Programme to Combat Racism of the World Council of Churches, September 1978. See also: WCC, 4223.13.17, Baldwin Sjollema, 'A "First Answer" to Critics of the World Council's Action', *Sunday*, 5 (1970), 12–13.

882 WCC, 4223.13.17, Baldwin Sjollema, 'A "First Answer" to Critics of the World Council's Action', *Sunday*, 5 (1970), 12–13. Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 42.

883 WCC, 4223.13.17, Baldwin Sjollema, 'A "First Answer" to Critics of the World Council's Action', *Sunday*, 5 (1970), 12–13, quote from p. 12.

884 Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 16, *emphasis mine*.

885 *Ibid.*, pp. 18–19. Darcus Howe called the grants 'a tremendous and useful commitment'. As cited in: Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 54.

for a further \$300,000 was immediately made to member churches; an amount which was surpassed several times.⁸⁸⁶ During the first five years, out of a total fund of \$1,050,000, the grants mainly went to groups in Southern Africa, such as PAIGC in Guinea-Bissau, FRELIMO in Mozambique, MPLA, GRAE and UNITA in Angola, SWAPO in Namibia, the ANC in South Africa, and ZANU and ZAPU in Rhodesia.⁸⁸⁷ As well as these organisations, groups in North America, Europe, Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and Australia also received funding.⁸⁸⁸ In total, this initial five-year period saw fifty-five organisations receive grants, out of a much larger pool of applicants. In terms of donors to the Fund, the largest amount given came from the Netherlands: a quarter of the total contributions plus an additional \$179,000 from the Dutch government. The USA, Germany, and Sweden each donated one sixth of the total \$1,050,000, mainly from local churches. Moreover, the Swedish government match-funded the contributions made by the Swedish churches. Smaller donations, although not relative to church wealth, also came from member churches in Asia and Africa. However, the smallest overall contributions, relative to church wealth, came from Britain, New Zealand, and Australia.⁸⁸⁹

The low levels of donations from Britain represent the controversy the PCR generated in the UK.⁸⁹⁰ Overall, whilst there were some nuances – for instance the Iona Community in Scotland and the Methodists – most churches in Britain were sceptical and critical of the PCR and refused to donate to it because of concerns over the 'support' of violence.⁸⁹¹ This scepticism and conflation of the PCR with grants to liberation movements also regrettably meant that discussions about racism in England or Britain were not provoked as a result of the Programme. This shows that, however much impact the Notting Hill

886 \$200,000 would be approximately \$1,220,000 in 2014. Figure obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. 'Race: Church Gives Lead', *Methodist Recorder*, 28 August 1969, p. 1. Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 14.

887 WCC, 4223.13.17, 'World Council's Anti-Racism Gifts Spark World-Wide Debate', *Sunday*, 5 (1970), 10–12.

888 The figures were: Southern Africa, \$688,000; North America, \$126,000; Europe, \$91,000; Latin America and the Caribbean, \$85,000; Australia, \$43,000; and Asia, \$17,000. Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 16.

889 Adler, *A Small Beginning*, pp. 14, 44.

890 See the following for a discussion of British Church reactions to the PCR: Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 362–379.

891 *Ibid.*, p. 370. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, pp. 14–25. See the following for the reactions of the various Methodist churches in the USA to the demands of Forman's Manifesto. Lechtreck, "'We Are Demanding \$500 Million For Reparations'", pp. 57–60.

Consultation may have had on the World Council, its impact did not necessarily extend to individual churches and Christians in England and the UK more generally. Moreover, whilst the BCC did give qualified *general* support to the PCR, the support 'certainly went beyond what a great deal of grass-roots feeling would have endorsed'.⁸⁹² This lack of support carried on into the seventies with the British churches expressing extreme reluctance to the WCC's call to divest from southern African states in 1972. The Church of England even voted in 1975 to reduce its donations to the WCC in order to express its dissatisfaction with the actions of the PCR.⁸⁹³ Elizabeth Adler has asked if the opposition to the grants was truly about the morality of violence, or if it was not about the principle of undermining and overthrowing the economic and political system of the West?⁸⁹⁴ The lack of enthusiasm for economic sanctions by British Churches would lend credence to this analysis.

As well as opposition to the use of violence and the application of economic sanctions, much opposition to the PCR from British churches can also be contextualised in a backlash against the leftist-slant of the churches social and political involvement during the later sixties, as well as suspicions over an international Marxist-inspired plot to overthrow 'civilised' standards. As such, the PCR showed more than anything how divided the world churches were when it came to action in the political sphere.⁸⁹⁵ For some churches, such as the majority of those in Britain, it was a completely shocking programme of action; but for others, the PCR was too small of a beginning. Writing in 1975, Bishop Kenneth Sansbury surmised that the average (white) British suburbanite, churchgoer or not, valued 'law and order' and therefore viewed liberation

892 A good example of this lack of 'grass-roots' support is a poll undertaken by the Christian *Sunday* journal which asked their mainly Anglican readers whether they supported the PCR: there was an emphatic no from 98.5% of the 937 people who responded. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 16. WCC, 4223.13.17, Peter Harvey, 'No! - most emphatically. Sunday readers overwhelming disapprove World Council of Churches anti-racist aid', *Sunday*, n.d., c. 1970, p. 17.

893 Thomas Mulhall states that of the 3,502 million rands worth of foreign investment in South Africa in 1969, Britain's share was 2,403 million rands and the USA's share was 596 million rands. In 1976, 63% of the total £7,660 million EEC investment in South Africa originated in Britain. Mulhall, *A Lasting Prophetic Legacy*, pp. 174, 197. Adler, *A Small Beginning*, pp. 23, 28, 48, 50. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 20. 'Unease over grants', *Guardian*, 8 July 1974, p. 7.

894 Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 33.

895 WCC, 4223.13.17, Edwin Barker, Board for Social Responsibility, Report on Civil Strife, Second Draft, 23 March 1971. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, pp. 22–23. Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', pp. 373–374. Adler, *A Small Beginning*, p. 1.

movements as extremist and 'as a threat to the established way of things'. Moreover, he also stated that the ideology and tactics of liberation movements had not been understood by the (white) British public because white Britons were still struggling to come to terms with the loss of Empire. Indeed, as Revd Elliott Kendall, Africa Secretary of the Conference of British Missionary Societies said, 'As an imperial power, defending its gains, we have an instinctive reaction against those who rise up against white authority. There is deep colonial race prejudice in Britain'.⁸⁹⁶ Or, as Philip Potter, the Dominican Methodist General Secretary of the WCC (1972-1984) was to say in 1975, British society is 'one of the most racist in history'.⁸⁹⁷

The Archbishop of Canterbury was also highly critical of the grants made to revolutionary groups, and this will also have had a strong effect on British (Christian) opinion. As we have seen before in respect of his refusal to speak alongside Oliver Tambo, Ramsey was quite keen to not upset (white) South African Christian opinion. As such, he claimed that the grants to liberation movements encouraged 'emotional belligerence' and did not address questions over what a just war or just rebellion might be. Furthermore, he was deeply critical of the focus on *white* racism and claimed that it was a mistaken limitation. He even claimed to not know why the Programme focussed on it.⁸⁹⁸ Given his presence at the Notting Hill Consultation and at the follow-up Canterbury meeting, this seems like a peculiar position to take since the Consultation, its reports, the August Canterbury meeting, and the background discussions in Uppsala in 1968 all made it perfectly clear why there was such an urgent focus on white racism: its links to a deeply exploitative economic system.

In contrast, there were reports of an improved standing of the *world* churches amongst black British people, Christians and otherwise, because of the PCR. However, this positive response was coupled both with a feeling that the PCR did not go far enough, *and* with a deepened cynicism of the specifically white *British* churches and Christians for their lack of enthusiasm for the PCR. To this

896 Additionally, Canon Paton said that the PCR 'compelled the disclosure of British racial prejudices'. As cited in, Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, pp. 14, 22, 25.

897 Burton, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism', p. 375.

898 Baden Hickman, 'Dr Ramsey attacks WCC', *Guardian*, 17 February 1971, p. 20. Basil Gingell, 'Primate attacks "freedom" grants', *The Times*, 17 February 1971, p. 5. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 14.

end, Darcus Howe of *Race Today* noted how difficult many black people found it to believe that the journal had received funding from the churches.⁸⁹⁹ Perhaps unsurprisingly given what we have learnt so far, of all the white-led British churches, the Methodist Church was the strongest supporter of the PCR.⁹⁰⁰ Alongside the NHMC's statement in support noted in Chapter Two, Pauline Webb, who was a prominent Methodist laywoman working both for the WCC and the Methodist Church said,

I believe the PCR has been the most significant educational programme in the Churches over the past five years. Its first achievement has been to expose the racism which is latent in our society and in the life of the Church and I think exposure is the first step towards repentance. Certainly I have found that in discussion with people it is only when they have been able to recognise how racism is built into the very structure of their thinking that they can even begin to face up to the realities of the situation and to work towards some change.⁹⁰¹

However, despite overall approval by the Methodists, it should be noted that Donald Soper did not support the grants to liberation movements due to his committed pacifist stance.⁹⁰²

The Legacies of the Consultation in Notting Hill: The Free University for Black Studies

Whilst the PCR is best known for funding liberation movements in Southern Africa, it did also fund some organisations in the UK of which the Free University was one.⁹⁰³ Another was Towards Racial Justice which published the journal *Race Today* amongst other ventures, and was awarded multiple grants by the PCR over the course of the seventies totalling at least \$98,500.⁹⁰⁴

899 Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, pp. 25–28.

900 Although this did not stand true for the Methodist Church in Ireland. Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, pp. 16–17, 31–32. The Methodist Church in the USA was one of the first churches to donate to the PCR: \$100,000. 'American Methodists First With Race Gifts', *Methodist Recorder*, 13 November 1969, p. 5.

901 Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 24.

902 NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, November 1970. Ivan Yates, 'The churches and guerrillas', *Observer*, 20 September 1970, p. 17.

903 See the following for a discussion of the PCR's activities in South Africa: Mulhall, *A Lasting Prophetic Legacy*, pp. 179–209.

904 Towards Racial Justice (TRJ) was established by the Institute of Race Relations (IRR) in 1972 in order to be able to do work its charitable status prevented it from doing. TRJ was awarded \$10,000 in 1974, \$15,000 in 1975, \$30,000 in 1976, \$25,000 in 1977, \$18,500 in 1978, and \$12,500 in 1979. WCC, 4223.3.38, The Institute of Race Relations: Towards Racial Justice, 25 July 1972. 4223.3.39, Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Alexander Kirby, 22 February 1974. Britain: Towards Racial Justice, PCR/SF/76, Europe no. 6, n.d., c. 1976. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Darcus Howe, 22 August 1976. Letter from Lorine Burt to Baldwin Sjollema, 16 August 1977. Letter from Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Darcus

Additionally, despite fierce opposition and disapproval of the journal *Race Today* (the General Secretary of the BCC, H.O. Morton, said that he considered much of what it produced 'abysmal' and felt it stirred up 'racial tension'), Towards Racial Justice was also funded by the Community and Race Relations Unit (CRRU) of BCC on at least two occasions.⁹⁰⁵ The Institute of Race Relations (IRR) which once housed *Race Today*, also received multiple grants both from the PCR, the BCC, and other Christian bodies.⁹⁰⁶ Another British campaigning organisation funded by the PCR was the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants which received various grants throughout the seventies, as did the West Indian Standing Conference, the Africa Bureau, and the Anti-Apartheid Movement.⁹⁰⁷ As Jenny Bourne has remarked, during the seventies the churches were some of the only organisations which were 'supporting this kind of black initiative'.⁹⁰⁸ For reasons of space and the fact that it was based in Notting Hill, just the Free University will be considered.

The Free University for Black Studies was a Notting Hill venture which was instigated by Roy Sawh and other black radicals in London in the late sixties. Owing to the fact that the Free University appears in this chapter because of its relationship to the WCC and the PCR, what follows below is mainly a study of the funding of the Free University and its relationship with Christian bodies, rather than its operations. Although there is necessarily a short description of the aims of the Free University.⁹⁰⁹ This focus also enables light to be shed on

Howe, 20 March 1978. Letter from Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Darcus Howe, 26 September 1978. Letter from Letter from Darcus Howe to Baldwin Sjollema, 9 October 1979.

905 The CRRU awarded TRJ £4,350 for the running of a telephone Legal Advice Service in 1973, and £4,000 for general operating expenses in 1974. WCC, 4223.3.39, H.O. Morton, The British Council of Churches PCR Review Committee, PCR Special Fund and Proposed Grant to TRJ, July 1975. See also: Sansbury, *Combating Racism*, pp. 53–54.

906 For instance, the IRR received \$7,500 in 1973, \$5,000 in 1975, and \$5,000 in 1976 as well as multiple smaller grants from the BCC over a longer period. It also received funding from other Christian organisations such as the Methodist Missionary Society. WCC, 4223.3.38, Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 24 January 1973. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 22 April 1975. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 23 August 1976. Sivanandan and Bourne, Interviewed by the author.

907 The Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants received \$10,000 in 1977, \$12,500 in 1978, and \$12,500 in 1979. WCC, 4223.3.38, Letter from Vishnu Sharma to Baldwin Sjollema, 17 August 1977. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Ian Martin, 26 September 1978. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Ian Martin, 22 October 1979. 4223.13.17, 'World Council's Anti-Racism Gifts Spark World-Wide Debate', *Sunday*, 5 (1970), 10–12.

908 Sivanandan and Bourne, Interviewed by the author. Sansbury, *Combating Racism*, p. 23.

909 Another reason for this focus is because the author does not have access to the records of the Free University, if indeed they even exist. The author can only find brief 'name-check'

how the PCR's funding decisions were interpreted by different Christian groups and people within England, as well as on the networks of solidarity between white Christians and black radicals. It also shows something of the effects of the Consultation on Notting Hill.

Racism in education was highlighted in the official report of the Notting Hill Consultation, as were calls to underwrite businesses and to make property available at low cost to organisations resisting racist oppression. Alongside the commitment and seven-point action plan to eradicate racism from Church educational programmes, was a more general acknowledgement of the ways in which educational environments helped to sustain and perpetuate racism.⁹¹⁰ This led the report's authors to state that 'Education has to be revolutionized so that it may become a powerful influence for the removal of prejudice, the establishment of a just society and the emergence of world brotherhood and unity'.⁹¹¹

The report's authors noted two main ways which racism was perpetuated in the educational arena: through the inequality of educational opportunities, and through cultural domination through curriculum bias. In respect of the former, the report was referring to the lack of educational opportunities for the majority of children in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In respect of the latter, the report asserted that 'the content of education everywhere has become largely oriented towards western civilization with its tendency to ignore the achievements of other cultures and civilizations'. By depriving people of colour 'of a sense of the value of their own culture in a pluralistic society, [they] are living in a state of oppression which cannot be endured'.⁹¹² With these priorities in mind, it is easy to see why the WCC would choose to fund the Free University as it sought

mentions of the organisation in secondary literature such as: Myers and Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education', p. 511, n. 44. Sivanandan, 'From Resistance to Rebellion', p. 31.

910 In fact, over two pages were dedicated to plans to eradicate racism in education. As such, the Free University was not the only British educational project funded by the PCR in the seventies. For instance, in 1975 it gave \$5,000 to a Racism in Education project. 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969. See also various documents in: WCC, 4223.7.15.

911 4223.1.03, World Council of Churches Report on the World Council of Churches Sponsored Consultation on Racism Held in Notting Hill, London, 19-24 May 1969 to the Central Committee Meeting in August 1969.

912 *Ibid.* These statements are very much akin to the recent #whitecurriculum social media campaign spearheaded by UCL students. See: 'Why is my curriculum white?', 9 December 2014, <<http://www.dtmh.ucl.ac.uk/videos/curriculum-white/>> [accessed 15 September 2016]

especially to address the latter.

Alongside internal funding drives led by the organisers of the Free University, the funding of the Free University for Black Studies was spearheaded by David Head, the General Secretary of the Student Christian Movement (SCM). Head was a Methodist and under his guidance, it was said that the SCM 'turned sharply left'.⁹¹³ Roy Sawh had informed the SCM of the needs of the Free University during the SCM's September 1969 General Council and, after careful debate, the SCM voted, by a significant majority, to support the Free University and to assist in raising money for the venture. An immediate collection from members present at that meeting raised £260 which was used to stock the Free University's lending library. More importantly than that however, was the concerted and sustained efforts by David Head to commit to raising £10,000 in order to buy a building for the Free University.⁹¹⁴ Moreover, the SCM also committed to donating £1 for every 10s raised by its members from its capital resources, up to a maximum combined total of £10,000. SCM's rationale for supporting the Free University in this manner was the decision of WCC to create and fund the PCR with its own resources in order 'to support self-help projects of oppressed peoples'.⁹¹⁵ Head and the SCM saw the Free University as a perfect, local expression of the PCR's mandate.

The Free University for Black Studies should be situated in the context of the supplementary school movements of the seventies. It was rooted both in the 'anti-university concept' which thought that education should be about disrupting the status quo (unlike conventional universities which supported it), and in the belief that the British education system fundamentally and specifically failed black people.⁹¹⁶ In respect of any 'black studies' taught within conventional

913 Malcolm Stuart, 'SCM may lose charity status', *Guardian*, 2 August 1972, p. 8.

914 In 2014, £260 would be approximately £3,822 and £10,000 would be approximately £138,100. Figures obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. It should be noted that both the money and the hoped for building were to be held by the Trust Association of the SCM, accordingly at the request of Roy Sawh. Student Christian Movement Archives (SCM), A416, Free University for Black Studies, The 1970 Appeal by the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland Booklet. Letter from Iain Duff to David Head, n.d., c. November 1970.

915 SCM, A416, Free University for Black Studies, The 1970 Appeal by the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland Booklet.

916 SCM, A416, Roy Sawh, Questions and Answers on the Free University for Black Studies, n.d., c. 1970. See the following research blog for original materials related to the Antiuniversity of London: Jakob Jakobsen, 'The Antihistory project', <<http://antihistory.org>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. Michael X's Black House also aimed to provide education in languages (Swahili, Arabic, Twi, etc.), history, politics, economics, philosophy, etc. See:

educational environments, the Free University dismissed the courses as being based in distorted myths perpetuated by Europeans, and, crucially, as not being available 'to the right kind of students – you don't get any black workers there for example'.⁹¹⁷ Therefore, the Free University sought to counter the distortion of black history in order to understand the present situation of the 'Third World' with the 'right perspective'. As a surprisingly sympathetic *Times* article put it, 'Black studies is therefore the academic pursuit of the other side of the coin, of the experience of being on the wrong end of discovery, colonialism, exploitation'.⁹¹⁸ Whilst not explicitly calling itself a Black Power (or Marxist) organisation, the Free University asserted that 'Black Power is relevant to any society where there are repressed and exploited people'.⁹¹⁹

Whilst the Free University was open to black and white students, it was no supporter of integration. Integration, understood as a form of assimilation, was not the answer to Britain's racialised problems as it was seen as 'a subterfuge for retaining white supremacy'. Furthermore, the Free University noted that 'we have to be critical as to what we would be aspiring to integrate with'. If the discrimination and exploitation that oppressed peoples suffered in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean (and it is these groups of people which the Free University was referring to when talking of 'black people' – as in, political blackness), was to end, then black people needed to be able to 'develop a pride in their own history, colour, cultural background and future as a separate racial group'. After which, a genuinely 'pluralistic society where different cultures can exist side by side without tensions, with mutual respect and with equal opportunities for all' could develop.⁹²⁰

As its name suggests, the Free University was indeed free: there were no qualifications required for entry, no exams, and there were no fees to attend. It operated on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday evenings from 8pm and reported

EPA, D4490/9, *The Black House* (London: Racial Adjustment Action Society, n.d., c. 1970). For more information supplementary school movement see the references in n. 407.

917 Thus supporting Myers and Grosvenor's assertion that supplementary schools were the products of social action and of 'communities who came together to supplement and correct perceived weaknesses in state education'. Myers and Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education', pp. 505, 516, quote from p. 516.

918 Clifford Longley, 'Controversial evolution of the Free University of Black Studies: An experiment in black education in Britain', *The Times*, 28 October 1971, p. 16.

919 SCM, A416, Roy Sawh, Questions and Answers on the Free University for Black Studies, n.d., c. 1970.

920 *Ibid.*, emphasis his.

to attract between 30-40 students per lecture. Mondays were dedicated to African affairs and saw lectures on nationalisation in Central Africa, economic and political developments in respect of Nkumrah's Ghana, and the social and cultural life of the people of Somalia. Wednesdays were devoted to Asian affairs and included lectures on post-colonial Malaysian cultural and economic development, Indian cultural history, and the cultural revolution in China. Finally, Fridays were for Latin American and Caribbean affairs as well as general Marxist-Leninist studies. Lectures on a Friday included Brazilian social life, dialectical and historical materialism, rebellions in Trinidad, and comparisons between the Caribbean, the USA and South Africa. Lecturers at the Free University included Haroon Jadakhan, Chen Chimutengwende, Ansel Wong, Bernard Coard, and Sawh himself.⁹²¹

Initially, the Free University was based, rent free, in a Toc H building in Pembridge Gardens, W2. Toc H, an international Christian organisation, had opened a community house in the area in 1968 under the leadership of Chris Holmes, through which it aimed to aid in community and 'race relations' in Notting Hill by providing a base for 10-12 residents to work in the wider community. As such, it housed an international group of residents (Trinidadian, American, English, and Guyanese, including Sawh for a spell) who worked or volunteered in local projects such as the Adventure Playground and the Kensington and Chelsea Inter-Racial Council (IRC). Additionally, the house offered meeting space for groups such as the Free University and the IRC, housed a printing press which offered low cost printing facilities for a black newspaper called *The Hustler* and other community newspapers, and offered rehearsal space for a local steel band.⁹²²

921 SCM, A416, Some questions answers on the Free University for Black Studies Leaflet, n.d., c. 1970. Roy Sawh, Questions and Answers on the Free University for Black Studies, n.d., c. 1970. Lectures 1972, The Free University for Black Studies, n.d., c. April 1972. The Free University for Black Studies, Lecture List, n.d., c. February 1972. The lecture topics again supports Myers and Grosvenor's assertion that black supplementary schools often mapped the impact of colonialism, and celebrated moments of resistance to colonial and imperial rule in order to construct traditions and histories of opposition to colonialism. See: Myers and Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education', pp. 517–518.

922 Pansy Jeffrey, Donald Chesworth and David Mason of the NHSC were all on the management committee of Toc H. LMA, LMA/4462/P/01/022, Memorandum on Activities taking place at Toc H Mark 1, 1969. Letter to Pansy Jeffrey from Alec Churcher, 1 August 1969. Chris Holmes, Memorandum on Activities taking place at Toc H Mark 1, n.d., c. May 1969. NHMC, Notting Hill Group Ministry Associates Newsletter, December 1968. SCM, A416, Roy Sawh, Questions and Answers on the Free University for Black Studies, n.d.. Chris Holmes, 'Notting Hill: part two', *Point Three* (April 1969), 71–72. See Chapter Three

By February 1971, Toc H had decided to close the community house which put the Free University in a precarious position. It was at this point that David Mason and the NHSC became involved by taking on a lease of the Toc H premises so that the Free University still had a base from which to operate. However, given the financial burden this placed on the NHSC, it was not certain how long they could maintain the lease, so David Head wrote once more for money to the WCC. Head's first application in February 1970 to the PCR for £5,000 on behalf of the Free University had been rejected later that year.⁹²³ He continued fundraising, but by early 1971, funds for the Free University were nowhere near the £10,000 they were aiming for in order to buy a property through which to secure its future.⁹²⁴ Head was finding fundraising extremely hard work and had even damaged some long-standing ties in the process of doing so. Requests for funding were made to various university Divinity or Theology departments such as Oxford, Edinburgh, and Bristol, but Head received rejections from one and all. Various colleges in Oxford (Oriel, Merton, and Jesus) all rejected on the grounds that they were opposed to the use of 'black' in the manner which the Free University deployed the term, as well as objecting to the use of the term 'university' which they felt to be pretentious.⁹²⁵

Much like Oxford, the rejection from Revd Fred Welbourn at Bristol University's Theology Department included, amongst many other things, an objection to the use of the term university and a general sense that the Free University was infringing on its turf. As well as Welbourn, the head of department, Revd Kenneth Grayston, also wrote to Head and eventually ended up dissociating himself from the SCM completely because of the SCM's decision to support the

for more on the IRC.

923 SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Baldwin Sjollema, 19 February 1971. Letter from David Head to the Programme to Combat Racism, 17 February 1970. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to David Head, 9 July 1970. Letter from David Head to Baldwin Sjollema, 24 August 1970.

924 The SCM had managed to raise £300 from students, the World Student Christian Federation had donated £500, the Edinburgh SCM branch had raised £26 in a jumble sale, and the Free University themselves had raised at least £60 through a social evening. The Welsh branch refused to fund the project at all. SCM, A416, Letter from Fraser McNeil-Watson to David Head, 5 January 1971. Letter from Eleri Roberts to David Head, 3 February 1970. Letter from David Head to Baldwin Sjollema, 19 February 1971.

925 SCM, A416, Letter from Thomas Brown to Chris MacKenna, 12 May 1970. Letter from Chris MacKenna to David Head, 19 May 1970. Letter from David Head to Chris MacKenna, 4 June 1970. Letter from Douglas Templeton to David Head, n.d., c. March 1970. See also the following for a short review of the criticisms of the Free University by the churches: Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, pp. 54–55.

Free University. Furthermore, the Bishop of Bristol, Oliver Tomkins, wrote to express his 'disgust and dismay' at the SCM's involvement with the Free University, declined to give his annual subscription to the SCM, and said that he regretted his relationship with the SCM was covenanted. Others, such as the Revd Prof. J.R. Porter, stated that no responsible church or person should give so much as a penny towards the venture.⁹²⁶ As Head was to later say to Baldwin Sjollema of the WCC, 'We have to face the fact that we cannot expect to claim money from trusts or "establishment" bodies for a project such as this'.⁹²⁷

The fact that Head was willing to sacrifice long-standing relationships with other (prominent) Christians stands as testament to his belief in the Free University. Indeed, the lengthy replies he made to Fred Welbourn and others in defence of the Free University say much about his sincerity and belief in the venture.⁹²⁸ When attempting to secure £5,500 from the sale of Student Movement House to use for the Free University, he said that he was thoroughly convinced that the Free University was 'one of the most impressive attempts at "International work based in London" that I have come across'.⁹²⁹ Later, when handing over the WCC and SCM grants to the Free University, Head was to say that, 'I believe in the work of the Free University more than I ever did, and am hoping that as my present work comes to an end, I may have more time to share in activities'. He further mentioned the possibility of setting up a community house, which SCM had already made a grant towards, and if this was successful, it would include rooms for the Free University should they choose to take them.⁹³⁰

Eventually, after a second application to the PCR for funding in July 1971, the

926 SCM, A416, Letter from Fred Welbourn to David Head, 27 February 1970. Letter from Kenneth Grayston to David Head, 13 March 1970. Letter from the Bishop of Bristol Oliver Tomkins to David Head, 12 March 1970. Elsewhere, Tomkins is recorded as saying that the point of the ecumenical movement was to 'go on talking to the man you want to hang'. Apparently this was only so in respect of some subjects and some people. Cited in: Sansbury, *Combatting Racism*, p. 14. Basil Gingell, 'Churches split on revolution aid', *The Times*, 27 October 1971, p. 2.

927 SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Baldwin Sjollema, 19 February 1971.

928 SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Fred Welbourn, n.d., c. March 1972. This letter was 6 pages long.

929 SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Members of SMH Administration Committee, 17 March 1971.

930 SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Haroon Jadhakhan, 16 February 1972. In the end, a general assembly of the SCM did not back Head's scheme for a 'community house of international critical education' and he resigned from the organisation over the decision. Malcolm Stuart, 'SCM may lose charity status', *Guardian*, 2 August 1972, p. 8.

Free University was to receive a grant for the amount of \$2,500. Head used the validation provided by this award to write to other sympathetic organisations in Britain such as the Runnymede Trust, the Institute of Race Relations, and the Community Relations Committee requesting further donations; all three organisations declined. However, in March 1972 and in what surely must have been a frustrating turn from the perspective of David Head, Roy Sawh decided to publicly declare his intention to return the WCC donation. Not having the records of the Free University itself, it is unknown why this was, but an internal WCC memorandum suggests that the reason may have been partly due to the fact that the grant did not act as a stimulus to member churches within the UK to further support the Free University. Sjollema also suggested that it was perhaps a symbolic gesture to challenge the churches to do better.⁹³¹

In a further twist, the original cheque from the WCC had been handed over to the Free University by the SCM in February 1972, with an additional £1,000 donation from SCM's own reserves. It was done so on the proviso that the cash was to be used for current rent costs, or set aside and used later for the purchase of a building. Naturally the donation was banked. Therefore, when it came to returning the donation to the WCC, this necessitated a new cheque being written by Sawh which subsequently bounced owing to the fact that a necessary second signatory was omitted. Despite several months of attempting to contact Sawh through various people and organisations in Britain, Sjollema was unsuccessful in getting a response to his requests.⁹³² However, in

931 WCC, 4223.3.21, Letter from David Head to Baldwin Sjollema, 27 July 1971. SCM, A416, Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to David Head, 13 September 1971. Memorandum from Baldwin Sjollema to Miss F Smith, 23 March 1972. SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Hugh Tinker (IRR), 1 October 1971. Letter from Hugh Tinker to David Head, 13 October 1971. Letter from David Head to Dipak Nandy (Runnymede), 17 September 1971. Letter from Sam Morris (CRC) to David Head, 7 January 1972.

932 The \$2,500 given by the PCR equated to £1,001.50. The total of at least £2,309.50 given to the Free University would equate to around £27,210 in today's money. Figure obtained from Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September 2016]. Sjollema contacted David Head, Sigrid Morden of the WCC UK's Liaison Committee, Pauline Webb of the Methodist Board of Lay Training and UK advisor for the PCR, and Douglas Tilbe of the Community and Race Relations Unit of the BCC. Additionally, the SCM wrote to Sawh about the bounced cheque and asked him to set it right after receiving the letter from Baldwin Sjollema. WCC, 4223.3.21, Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to David Head, 29 March 1972. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Sigrid Morden, 4 May 1972. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Douglas Tilbe, 24 May 1972. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to Pauline Webb, 9 June 1972. SCM, A416, Letter from David Head to Roy Sawh, 4 February 1972. Letter from David Head to Haroon Jadhakhan, 16 February 1972. FUBS Account, n.d., c. 1972. Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to David Head, 29 March 1972. Letter from the SCM to Roy Sawh, 14 April 1972.

September 1973, approximately 18 months after the initial rejection of the WCC funds by Sawh, three members of the committee of the Free University wrote to the WCC. In the letter they claimed that the money had been illegally removed from their bank account by Sawh on 24 May 1973 who had shortly after departed for Guyana to embark on a political career, although they also claimed that the bank was unable to produce a copy of the cashed cheque nor the statement showing the withdrawal. The trio asked for legal advice in respect of retrieving the money as they were 'extremely disturbed that there seems to be no likelihood of the money being used for the purpose for which it was intended viz. to carry out an experiment in education in Britain'.⁹³³

Sjollema finally wrote to David Mason in October 1973; he included the letter from the Free University and asked for his advice over whether or not to pursue legal action to retrieve the funds from Sawh. Mason counselled against this and advised that the best course of action would be to wait until Sawh were back in the UK, then he would approach him and demand the return of the money.⁹³⁴ It is unclear if the WCC ever did retrieve the money from Sawh, but no evidence was found that it was in fact returned. It is possible that Sawh saw the usage of the PCR grant to fund his political career in Guyana as a form of reparations along the lines of Fr. Groppi's support of the impoverished black child that stole or the black adults who looted: he was taking from an organisation he viewed as inherently exploitative. However, given the comparatively small amount of money available in the PCR funding pot, given the potential of the Free University, and given the glaring inconsistency between the importance of funding groups such as FRELIMO *vis-à-vis* someone's personal career, it does seem to have been a disappointing move on Sawh's behalf.

Conclusion

In many ways, it is difficult to assess the long-term effects of the Consultation on Notting Hill or England more generally. One answer could be none: there is little to no public memory of the Consultation, and the more radical strands of sixties Christianity as exemplified in the Special Fund seem to fare no better.⁹³⁵

933 WCC, 4223.3.21, Letter from Haroon Jadhakhan, Ronnie Eaton and Ali Polo to The Secretary of the World Council of Churches, 22 September 1973.

934 WCC, 4223.3.21, Letter from Baldwin Sjollema to David Mason, 19 October 1973. Letter from David Mason to Baldwin Sjollema, 6 November 1973.

935 The Consultation occurred at the end of the decade, so the aftermath of it was not the focus

However, if we are to examine a more immediate period we do find some impact. For, as well as the funding of the Free University, we find that George Clarke was to speak on 'race' and the housing situation in Notting Hill during the Consultation, and that there was clear support for the resolutions of the Consultation in the Ecumenical Centre's annual report of that year. In 1971, the Ecumenical Centre also hosted a ten-day course for WCC scholarship students which was designed to enable a multi-national group to explore cultural issues around decision making and leadership. During the course, the students visited the Free University for Black Studies, the GLC, and a community work venture in East London amongst other places. Starting later in the decade, and continuing for several years, Brian Frost the Programme Director for the Ecumenical Centre, founded an annual 'multi-racial' festival in Trafalgar Square called London Entertains which celebrated 'the diversity of the musical gifts of all the races of London'.⁹³⁶ So in some admittedly very small ways, the Consultation did have an impact on Notting Hill and the Group Ministry in the months and years which followed.

Being willing to house the Consultation at the Ecumenical Centre also demonstrated how Mason, and the Team Ministry, were a part of the critical engagement of the WCC with the problems racism wrought on societies globally. As Frost has said, the Team Ministry did not have to engage with these social issues – they could have run away from the politics of the sixties as many Christians did – and so Mason's enthusiasm for the Consultation shows a person in step with the mood of critical defiance of the structures of racism and white domination.⁹³⁷ The racist voices of the previous chapter were here finally acknowledged and challenged head-on by a global cohort of Christians and in this meeting, certain truths became known. For whilst it is clear that Mason, the Group Ministry, and many Methodists more broadly were in agreement with the focus on racism and supportive of the aims of the PCR, the backlash to the PCR by the majority of white English Christians tells another story. It is the same story which led the white British elites to focus on outmoded ideas during

of the research.

936 WCC, 4223.1.02, Statement by George Clarke, Notting Hill Housing Service, n.d., c. May 1969. LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, A World of Cities: Report of a Year's Work, n.d., c. 1969. Notting Hill Ecumenical Centre, Coming and Going: Report of a Year's Work, n.d., c. 1972. Frost, Interviewed by the author.

937 Frost, Interviewed by the author.

the Consultation: it is the story of 'race relations' which denied and avoided the racist foundations of its discourse in order to continue along well-trod and worn out avenues of 'integration' and the myths of a quintessential British tolerance *vis-à-vis* elsewhere in the world.

In respect of the philosophy of 'applied ecumenicity' which underpinned the Centre, it was truly lived out in the Consultation. It was a moment wherein the unity of humankind was tested, remade, and striven for in profoundly new ways for the churches, and it involved the opinions, experiences, and direction of those outwith the church proper. In this way, the Ecumenical Centre symbolised a site of internationalism whereby it opened English and British Christians up to radical, international anti-racist points of views which stood in stark opposition to the myth of tolerance. Yet, as opposition to the SCM's involvement with the Free University for Black Studies and Archbishop Ramsey's critique of the Special Fund showed, this exposure to diverse points of view did not necessarily represent the opening up of self (corporate or otherwise) to change. Indeed, it is shamefully easy to argue that the still radical seeming nature of the Consultation and the Special Fund tell us something important about the event: that its legacy is yet to be fully lived out. Which is, of course, something which many activists daily point out.

Conclusion

It hardly needs stating that Notting Hill of the twenty-first century is a vastly different place to that of the sixties. The neighbourhood has been largely cleansed of its working-class inhabitants and in this sense, the Borough Council's housing policies of the sixties have borne the fruit they hoped for. Notting Hill of the sixties is then an idea, a place truly past, and if the kinds of large-scale racist violence which opened this thesis were to occur today, it is hard to imagine them happening there. Notting Hill is elsewhere, in that respect; in other respects, Notting Hill is gone; in others still, it has simply changed. Poverty has been pushed elsewhere, and the attendant housing crises and lack of social amenities linger on in other neighbourhoods with other migrants and other working-classes.

Racism also lingers on. The August 2016 UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination report on Britain raises many concerns over the prevalence of racism in British social and political life. Some of these racisms are new, such as those fuelled by the anti-Muslim 'Prevent' strategy; however, many are painfully familiar such as the criminalisation of black youth, and widespread discrimination in employment and education. The report also mentions a 'lack of balanced teaching in the State party's schools about the history of the British Empire and colonialism, particularly with regard to slavery'.⁹³⁸ Thereby showing that, despite the decades of debates, the coloniser's point of view still retains an authoritative dominance. To return to an earlier phrase: still now, some fifty years later, there is still the denial of the presence of an alternate history in the contemporary social body.

The report also notes the failures of politicians to condemn racism and xenophobia during the 2016 EU Referendum campaign. Further, it also makes reference to the fact that some prominent politicians actively stoked racist sentiment during the campaign thereby leading to a rise in racist attacks. Tellingly, the report also noted that despite the recent rise in the reporting of racist hate crimes, these crimes are still predominantly under-reported. Worse, the report noted a significant gap between the hate crimes which were reported

⁹³⁸ United Nations, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Concluding observations on the twenty-first to twenty-third periodic reports of United Kingdom, CERD/C/GBR/CO/21-23, August 2016.

and active prosecutions. These observations are compounded by another criticism: that even where accurate data on racial discrimination was collected, there was a 'lack of systematic and effective use of data to develop policies to tackle' it.⁹³⁹ What this latter observation in particular suggests, is an active effect of the myth of tolerance: despite having decades of proof of endemic indigenous racism, the government still fails to act. To act would, of course, be to acknowledge, and to acknowledge would be to puncture the myth of an essentially tolerant nation. A myth which, now just as in the sixties, must be retained in spite of all the evidence to the contrary.

Unlike today, the sixties were a decade in which the everyday voices of the nation failed to secure their referendum on 'immigration' and repatriation, but were instead granted a set of increasingly restrictive and racist Immigration and Nationality Acts. Here the myth of tolerance was punctured quietly behind the complexities of language which whitened the nation as it proclaimed otherwise.⁹⁴⁰ The sixties were also a decade where the myth of tolerance, as operating through the sphere of 'race relations', complicated the abilities of even the most well-meaning of people – black and white – to fully achieve racial justice. 'Race relations' was, and is, a sociological field not an empirical fact, yet this was rarely acknowledged by any 'race relations' professional in the decade.⁹⁴¹ Rather, due to a lack of coherent theorisation about 'race', people – well-meaning and otherwise – behaved as if distinct human 'races' did in fact exist. Those operating in the field of 'race relations' therefore sought to restrict or alleviate friction between them. This is, of course, an impossible dialectic, and by the time the Team Ministry began work in Notting Hill, various racialised communities were indeed a sociological fact, and they could have done nothing more than to work with that. To not recognise that would have been to advance a form of retrogressive, 'colour-blind', universalised identity which would have denied racism in a different way.

In the end, the 'race relations' paradigm could never solve the problem it alleged to exist for, as its very modes of operation constructed, solidified, and

939 United Nations, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Concluding observations on the twenty-first to twenty-third periodic reports of United Kingdom, CERD/C/GBR/CO/21-23, August 2016.

940 Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*.

941 See Chris Waters masterful study of 'race relations' professionals in the decade prior: "Dark Strangers" in Our Midst'.

entrenched the boundaries it claimed to want to push past. The real animating force of 'race relations' was in fact racism: it both constructed the various racialised identities of England *and* made the relationships between them problematic. As such, by ignoring or downplaying the realities of racism, 'race relations' professionals (in the loosest sense of the term) sought to harmonise across impossible divisions. Impossible precisely because the racialised divide which these groups and individuals sought to make constructive links between, was often impenetrable precisely because the reason for the divide was never properly addressed.

The myth of tolerance did then function as a mechanism of denial. It is therefore important to recognise its operations in the landscapes of English histories. It operated strategically by simultaneously acknowledging 'race' and racialised issues but by downplaying racism: white people were essentially well-meaning, or uneducated, or misconstrued. They were inevitably seen as either essentially tolerant or irredeemably intolerant, no matter what their actions and words actually articulated. However, when the words and actions of white England are detached from this myth, when they are analysed in the cold light of the facts they take the shape of, we find a different history: a history of a nation in which racism flourished as an empirical fact. This is one of the main animating forces of the thesis – the desire to strip bare the facts of history from the rhetoric of tolerance. To show the racism of the nation nestled there, as Revd Kitagawa said, 'like boils'. And too, to show how those racisms were fought against and facilitated by various people, from various classes, and in various ways. To show that they were recognised by some people then, even as they are denied now. And in doing so, it is hoped that these facts of English history can be used as a target, as a way forward to more honest discussions about racialised forms of injustice and how the recent past was experienced by people, black and white, other than the myth-producing elites.

And here, too, we have a story of the differences in how a further past was understood; of how the histories of Empire and colonialism were used by white and black Britons in their racialised struggles. Here memories of Empire were used by black people and their white allies to explain and justify their presence within the metropole. An invisible Empire was made suddenly visible through

the very fact of black bodies in the space of England; and by claiming their rights as citizens, black people implicitly and explicitly interrogated and contested public memories of Empire. Conversely, white opponents sought to downplay and erase the bonds of Empire which, even as they spoke, were being rearranged, reconfigured, and consigned to 'the past' in the decolonising events and politics of the decade. For these white people, labours unseen, lives unknown, locales unimagined meant that the weight of the truths of black lives and labours were unfelt: ephemeral, transient scratches on a body politic past. I did not see, you were not there.

What this thesis has also shown however, is not just the tenacity of the myth of tolerance throughout the sixties, but also the numerous Christian contestations of it. Not only was there the continual strident internationalist, anti-colonial, and anti-racist voice of Trevor Huddleston, but the thesis also gave witness to a steady strengthening of the stance of many other white Christians in line with the broader character of the sixties. In broad-brush terms, some white Christians began the decade consuming and constructing colonial paternalism and ended it with radical articulations and condemnations of white racism in the 1969 Notting Hill Consultation. From here followed commitments to the fights Christians must engage in to adequately begin to *eradicate* racism. This brought true solidarity with black liberation movements for the first time and as a consequence, white power and authority was *somewhat* conceded. But, of course, the corollary to this story is that many did not concede this ground, and in this space was located many other white English Christians.

In more detailed terms, the story of the Team Ministry at Notting Hill Methodist Church shows less of an evolution of stand-point and more a hindrance of their actions due to the saturation of the 'race relations' field with the myth of tolerance. Uncharacteristically for white English Christians, the Team Ministry was acutely aware from the beginning of the decade of the reality of English racisms. Indeed, the entire impetus for their experiment in Notting Hill relied upon this acknowledgement. As such, we saw how their tripartite project was unusually successful in involving, embracing, and supporting black lives. Under the leadership of the Team Ministry, the church community sought not to harmonise across racialised divides but rather to change its very composition

and ways of operating. The Team Ministry did this by standing before the various communities of Notting Hill with empty hands and open hearts and minds; and once there, they truly *listened*.

This willingness and capacity to listen should not be underestimated because it fundamentally changed the very orientation and direction of the ministers' work. In the sixties, white English people easily condemned racialised situations in the USA or South Africa, but there was, and is, much reticence to turn that critical gaze onto racialised situations in the UK, despite sustained black protest. In tandem with this avoidance of gaze was a championing of the US Civil Rights movement, something which also persists to this day. In fact, one would suggest that the reason contemporary English commentators freely evoke the US Civil Rights movement yet fail to engage with the history of similar struggles here, is precisely because of a continuation of this avoidance of focus: racism happens elsewhere. To recall a criticism of this deflection by Visser 't Hooft of the WCC in 1969, we can say that many white English people in the sixties, Christians and otherwise, averted their gaze from the English situation as they were fundamentally unwilling to pay the price of racial justice locally.⁹⁴²

However, in marked contrast to this was the work the Team Ministry engaged in: not only did they acknowledge the presence of racism in England, but they actively challenged it, even if not perfectly so. They did so because they *listened* to their black neighbours who, whilst generally internationalising their concerns, also spoke constantly and urgently of the need to fight racial injustice at home in England.

The ministers philosophy of 'empty-handedness' which led to the listening work coupled with the tripartite division of labour is possibly the root of the unique work the Team Ministry undertook. The listening work, alongside the very fact that they were a team, resulted in a strong emphasis on partnership with other people and organisations. This resulted not only in a larger Group Ministry involving their wives and other local Christians, but also in strong and enduring relationships with people and communities who were not a part of any church. Moreover, the acknowledgement and recognition of the multiplicity of communities operating in the neighbourhood meant a coalition style of working

942 Webb, 'Brotherhood, Betrayal, and Rivers of Blood', pp. 227–230. van der Bent, 'Logs in Our Eyes', p. 170.

which sought to unite differing groups without being necessarily desirous of Christian conversions nor of universalising any particular point of view. This meant that the Social Council was not subject to the debilitating and myriad leftist-activist splits of the late sixties. On this, Mason pointed out that his role as a minister equipped him to deal with these kinds of personality clashes as they often occurred within his congregations. It was therefore precisely the vocational experience gathered within the closed church community which enabled him to bridge divides amongst the wider, more politically and socially diverse Notting Hill communities.⁹⁴³

Despite not engaging in social and community work as a form of proselyting, it is important to underscore the importance of Christianity to the work the ministers did. Neither the work of the Social Council nor the projects and events of the Ecumenical Centre were ever shorn of their Christian roots and this must be taken seriously and reflected upon. Indeed, it was the very ethos of a particular form of socially and politically engaged Christianity which led to the coming together of the individual ministers into a Team, and the Team arriving in Notting Hill. Every act the Team Ministry undertook was an external manifestation of their strong belief in the relevancy of Christianity and the unity and responsibilities of a particular church in a particular place in the world. This aspect of their work must be acknowledged and engaged with as it demonstrates a vitality and vibrancy of Christianity which is often considered dead or dying by the sixties. The experiment of the Team Ministry at the Notting Hill Methodist Church stands there in defiance of an anachronistic narrative of 'decline'.

The story of the success of the Notting Hill Methodist Church in the sixties as a growing, vibrant body of Christians with a strong and well-used church suggests something deeper about the nature of Protestant Christian 'religion' and its relationship to 'faith' or 'belief'. It suggests that where Protestant Christianity *is* dying or declining to irrelevancy in England and Britain more widely, it is precisely in those churches which have failed to express themselves in terms other than 'faith' or 'belief'. As the story of the NHMC shows, a mainline, historic, Protestant church can grow, and grow strongly, vibrantly and in important ways,

943 Mason, Interviewed by the author.

if it seeks to be something more than an embodiment of 'faith'. If a church seeks to perform needed services, and, importantly, to allow the community to decide what those needs are, then it becomes a part of the community at large and much more than a capsule or container for the privatised and interior belief of a few devout souls. For where 'religion' is performed as 'culture', as the practise of everyday life, one finds a multifaceted, vibrant organism which reflects, and is appreciated by, the community within which it exists.

The Notting Hill Team Ministry is also an interesting study of the relationship of Christianity to politics. Given more contemporary critiques of the alleged failures of Muslims to understand the 'proper' boundaries of 'religion' and politics, the Team Ministry is an historic example of how deeply embedded some Christians were in the politics of everyday life. From lobbying local government, to being members of the Labour Party, to running social services the Conservative-run borough failed to provide, the Team Ministry and through them the Notting Hill Methodist Church, the Notting Hill Social Council, and the Ecumenical Centre, were continual sites of political engagement in one way or another. From the politics of 'race' to that of housing and youth work, the Team Ministry were guided by their ethics *as Christians* to campaign for and effect political change.

In all of their decisions and campaigns, the Team Ministry kept an attention to 'race'. In this, they must be lauded as unusual and exemplary. They represent, as was noted above, an experiment rooted in challenges to the inequalities of 'race', but too, despite all of the hard work and successes they achieved in the sixties, they also stand as a warning for two main reasons. These two caveats are important because the Team Ministerial experiment also shows that despite the willingness to change self and the church-body, despite the continual acts of listening and the philosophy of 'empty-handedness', and despite the acts of solidarity, this was not always enough due to the entrenched and hardened attitudes of the communities with which they worked.

The first hindrance to the work of the Team Ministry was their over-reliance on secular conceptions of 'race relations'. This is less about the Team Ministry *per se* and more broadly about who white Christians generally perceived as authorities and experts in this area during the sixties. One wonders if the turn to sociologists as the authorities on 'race' was rooted in a knowledge that internal,

Christian forms of knowledge regarding 'race' and culture generated through mission were inadequate in dealing with the complexities of 'race' inside the metropole and in a new era. As the lack of attention to migrants who came from backgrounds and cultures other than Christianity suggests, Christians did not necessarily transplant the mission fields upon London in the sixties. So, it is possible that the turn to sociological authority was both an implicit admission of the inadequacies of Christianity as a repository of knowledge on 'race', part of a desire to communicate beyond the boundaries of the Christian community, and also part of a desire to be perceived as a *modern*, moral force.

Sam Brewitt-Taylor has persuasively argued that Christians led the way in the invention of a secular society in the early sixties and in the creation of the sexual revolution in the late-sixties. In contrast, this thesis would suggest that this was not the case in respect of white Christians and 'race'.⁹⁴⁴ Rather, white Christians can be broadly said to have been reflecting and not leading society when it came to matters of 'race' and 'race relations'. However, what is interesting is *who* they were in fact listening to as the decade rolled by. Whilst liberals such as Archbishop Ramsey may have shifted from colonial paternalism to a sociological and assimilatory version of this, more progressive white Christians had a different intellectual trajectory. Firstly, colonialism and Empire tended to be foregrounded in ways it was not in the language of liberals. This led to a tendency towards critical acknowledgement of Empire, its legacies, and the debts owed to black people because of it, which was a stand-point that resonated more closely with the perspectives of black activists. So whilst progressive white Christians tended to begin the decade by turning to sociologists as the experts on 'race relations', as the decade ended, they instead turned to black people as the experts on their own lives and on the realities of racism as lived experience. In this way, by 1969, authority and experience was *to some degree* invested in black lives and the Programme to Combat Racism can therefore be seen as the beginning of a statement that black lives mattered. Trevor Huddleston was exceptional in this respect, as his experiences in South Africa meant that his speech and arguments always prioritised black points of view.

944 Brewitt-Taylor, 'The Invention of a "Secular Society"?''. Sam Brewitt-Taylor, 'Christianity and The Invention of the Sexual Revolution in Britain, 1963–1967', *The Historical Journal*, FirstView Article (2016), 1–28.

The second hindrance to the 'race relations' work of the Team Ministry was, perversely, their desire to work for and with *all* the members of the Notting Hill community. Clearly – as a group of people committed to the welfare of the whole of the neighbourhood – the ministers *had* to work in an inclusionary fashion. Despite a sensitive awareness and consideration of the differing needs of the various communities within Notting Hill, it was still the neighbourhood in a larger sense which they fought for. The perverse aspect of this, is that it was precisely this holistic drive and vision which both hampered and amplified their various successes and failures. This vision meant they were able to make connective links and perform solidarity work which enabled greater successes, but it also meant that they were forced to try to unify people who had already gathered into entrenched, and often hostile, racialised groups by the time the ministers had arrived in Notting Hill. The attempt to work across these borders and to maintain relationships with all groups of people sometimes meant that racism was not opposed head-on. This position was taken as they did not wish to alienate white working-class people who were clearly also disadvantaged and disenfranchised. However, it seems that a stronger anti-racist stance would have been to stand in solidarity with black working-class people in opposition to white racism, even if this meant alienating some white people, as black people were experiencing a further layer of racialised disadvantage. The situation on the ground was of course complicated and change came fast-footed to the world in that decade, and especially so to a group of people actively engaged in battling inequalities and in improving the social conditions around them. So the hindsight and reflection afforded to this author was not a luxury afforded to the ministers. But if the story can prove useful, it is to show that sometimes there is a need to be partisan when to fail to do so is to implicitly further a deeper oppression.

In 1972, Revd Norwyn Denny wrote to the Home Mission Department for funds to undertake a case study to record the experiment which was the Team Ministry in Notting Hill. In the letter, Denny suggested that a PhD student could be used to generate the research. Whilst agreeing that it was an important and necessary undertaking, the Home Mission Department were unable to provide the funds to undertake it; and, as far as this author is aware, the research did

not go ahead.⁹⁴⁵ It is unlikely that Denny envisaged an historian undertaking their doctoral work on the Team Ministry, but there is something of a happy coincidence that his wish was finally fulfilled some forty-four years later. To return to Bernadette McAliskey's point that small stories can recover lost histories, it is hoped that this small story of the Notting Hill Methodist Church can be used to not only more fully understand the complexities of 'race', 'race relations', and racism in England, but can also be used as an example of how the inclusion of 'religion' in social and cultural histories of the sixties can add a richness and a depth otherwise missing from 'secular' accounts.

945 LMA, ACC/3821/02/04, Letter from Norwyn Denny to Revd George Sails, 23 May 1972.
Letter from Revd George Sails to Norwyn Denny, 31 May 1972.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives in Public Collections:

BCA – Black Cultural Archives, London

BFI – British Film Institute, London

DCA – Donald Chesworth Archives, London

EPA – Enoch Powell Archives, Stafford

LMA – London Metropolitan Archives, London

LPA – Lambeth Palace Archives, London

RBKC – Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Archives, London

RSF – Religious Society of Friends Archives (Quakers), London

SCM – Student Christian Movement Archives, Birmingham

THP – Trevor Huddleston Papers, Oxford

TNA – The National Archives, Kew

WCC – World Council of Churches Archives, Geneva

Archives in Private Collections:

KCSC – Kensington and Chelsea Social Council Archives, London

NHMC – Notting Hill Methodist Church Archives, London

SDA – Stephen Duckworth Archives, London

Printed Primary Sources

Newspapers and Magazines:

Action (incorporating 'Union')

Black Ram

Church Times

Daily Mail

Ecumenical Press Service

Episcopalian

Guardian / Manchester Guardian

Kensington Post

Methodist Recorder

New Society

New Statesman

New York Times

Observer

Point Three

Race Today

Spectre

Tablet

Telegraph

The Times

West Indian Gazette

West London Observer

Official Publications:

Hansard

Immigration from the Commonwealth, Cmnd. 2739 (London: HMSO, 1965)

London Gazette

Methodist Conference Agenda (London: Methodist Church, 1968)

National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, *The First Six Months: a report of the work of the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants from September 1965 to March 1966* (London: NCCI, 1966)

Nehru, Jawaharlal, 'Closing Speeches of Heads of Delegations', in Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia, Asian-African Conference Bulletin, 10 June 1955, pp. 6–8

Office for National Statistics, *Full report – Women in the labour market* (London: ONS, 2013)

Race Relations Bill, Bill 186 (London: HMSO, 1968)

Report of the Committee on Housing in Greater London, Cmnd. 2605 (London: HMSO, 1965)

Report by Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council, Cmnd. 2119 (London: HMSO, 1963)

The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of the General Purposes Committee, Various Dates

The Royal Borough of Kensington, Minutes of Proceedings, Various Dates

UNESCO, *Statement on Race and Racial Prejudice*, 18-26 September 1967, 1–5 <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001860/186096eb.pdf>> [accessed 15 September 2016]

United Nations, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Concluding observations on the twenty-first to twenty-third periodic reports of United Kingdom, CERD/C/GBR/CO/21-23, August 2016

Other Primary Sources

Interviews:

Duckworth, Stephen, Interviewed by the author, 13 August 2015

Frost, Brian, Interviewed by the author, 25 October 2015

Mason, Revd David, Interviewed by the author, 21 January, 28 January, & 29 July 2015

Sivanandan, Ambalavaner, and Jenny Bourne, Interviewed by the author, 16 May 2014

Recordings:

Kensington & Chelsea Community History Group, *Notting Hill Methodist Church Remembers, 1955-1975*, June 2004

Speeches:

Gardiner, Robert, *A World of Peoples: The Reith Lectures, 1965* (London: BBC, 1966)

Huddleston, Trevor, *Education and Human Rights: The Text of a Public Lecture* (London: National Union of Teachers, 1969)

McAliskey, Bernadette, 'Ireland's Easter Rising - A Revolutionary Legacy', Bloomsbury Central Baptist Church, 7 March 2016

Television:

'My Christian Duty', *The Great Debate*, LWT, 12 October 1969

'Night Patrol Notting Hill', *ITV News*, 2 September 1958, <<http://jiscmediahub.ac.uk/record/display/039-00042583>> [accessed 16 August 2016]

'Southport: Rose of England – Colour Bar Violence', *Gaumont British News*, 8 September 1958, <<http://jiscmediahub.ac.uk/record/display/030-00038710>> [accessed 16 August 2016]

Websites:

'Arts and Community Centre Notting Hill, 1967-1972: An Interview with Dave Russell', Part One <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yKBFbh09sfE>>, Part

Two <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9HMsaA79Ns>>, Part Three
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x3VsNsXoRRg>>, Part Four
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mz9RYjKyq9w>> [accessed 15
September 2016]

Blenheim, <<http://blenheimcdp.org.uk>> [accessed 16 August 2016]

'Brigade pays tribute to London's first post-war black firefighter ahead of
ceremonial funeral', *London Fire Brigade*, 12 January 2016,
<[http://www.london-
fire.gov.uk/news/LatestNewsReleases_Ceremonialfuneralforfirstblackfirefight
er.asp](http://www.london-fire.gov.uk/news/LatestNewsReleases_Ceremonialfuneralforfirstblackfirefighter.asp)> [accessed 15 September 2016]

Draper, John, 'No Irish, no blacks, no dogs, no proof', *Guardian*, 21 October
2015, <[http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/oct/21/no-irish-no-blacks-
no-dogs-no-proof](http://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/oct/21/no-irish-no-blacks-no-dogs-no-proof)> [accessed 15 September 2016]

'History', World Council of Churches, <[http://www.oikoumene.org/en/about-
us/wcc-history](http://www.oikoumene.org/en/about-us/wcc-history)> [accessed 15 September 2016]

IFCO / Pastors for Peace, <<http://ifconews.org>> [accessed 15 September 2016]

Jakobsen, Jakob, 'The Antihistory project', <<http://antihistory.org>> [accessed 15
September 2016]

Kensington & Chelsea Social Council, 'Celebrating 50 Years of the Social
Council', <<https://www.kcsc.org.uk/50-years-kcsc>> [accessed 15 September
2016]

Lynn, Guy, and Ed Davey, 'London letting agents "refuse black tenants"', *BBC
News*, 14 October 2013, <[http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-
24372509](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-24372509)> [accessed 15 September 2016]

Measuring Worth, <<http://www.measuringworth.com>> [accessed 15 September
2016]

'Meet Pansy Jeffrey', Notting Hill Housing Group's 50th Anniversary Website,
<<http://www.nhh50.com/?people=meet-pansy-jeffrey>> [accessed 15
September 2016]

'Member Churches', World Council of Churches,
<<http://www.oikoumene.org/en/member-churches>> [accessed 15 September
2016]

Newbury, John, 'The Rev Norwyn Denny obituary', *Guardian*, 8 December
2010, <[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/dec/08/the-rev-norwyn-
denny](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/dec/08/the-rev-norwyn-denny)> [accessed 15 September 2016]

Nicholas, Michael, 'Frank Bailey obituary', *Guardian*, 26 January 2016,
<<http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jan/26/frank-bailey-obituary>>
[accessed 15 September 2016]

UCL, Legacies of British Slave-ownership, <<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/>>
[accessed 15 September 2016]

White, Michael, 'The Rev Bruce Kenrick', *Guardian*, 19 January 2007,

<<http://www.theguardian.com/news/2007/jan/19/guardianobituaries.obituaries>>
> [accessed 15 September 2015]

'Why is my curriculum white?', 9 December 2014,
<<http://www.dtmh.ucl.ac.uk/videos/curriculum-white/>> [accessed 15
September 2016]

Wilcox, Judy, and Jenny Williams, 'Susie Parsons obituary', *Guardian*, 22 June
2015, <<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/jun/22/susie-parsons>>
[accessed 15 September 2016]

Secondary Sources

'A Look at Britain', in Hill, and Mathews, eds., *Race*, pp. 153–169

Adi, Hakim, *West Africans in Britain 1900-1960: Nationalism, Pan-Africanism
and Communism* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1998)

Adler, Elizabeth, *A Small Beginning: An assessment of the first five years of the
Programme to Combat Racism* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1974)

Ahmed, Sara, 'Declarations of Whiteness', *borderlands ejournal*, 3 (2004)
<http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/ahmed_declarations.htm>,
[accessed 16 August 2016]

—, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (London:
Duke University Press, 2012)

—, *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality* (London:
Routledge, 2000)

Ainger, Geoffrey, *Jesus Our Contemporary* (London: SCM Press, 1967)

Aldred, Joe, *Respect: Understanding Caribbean British Christianity*
(Peterborough: Epworth, 2005)

All Faiths For One Race, *Talking Blues: The Black Community Speaks About Its
Relationship with the Police* (Birmingham: AFFOR, 1978)

Andrews, Kehinde, *Resisting racism: race, inequality and the Black
supplementary school movement* (London: Institute of Education Press,
2013)

Angelo, Anne-Marie, 'The Black Panthers in London, 1967-1972: A Diasporic
Struggle Navigates the Black Atlantic', *Radical History Review*, 103 (2009),
17–35

—, "'We All Became Black": Tony Soares, African-American Internationalists,
and Anti-imperialism', in Kelley, and Tuck, eds., *The Other Special
Relationship*, pp. 95–101

Armstrong, Brian G., 'Calvin, John', in Lindsay Jones, ed., *Encyclopedia of
Religion, 2nd Edition, Vol. 3* (Detroit: Macmillan Reference, 2005), pp. 1374–
1377

Asad, Talal, 'The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category', in

- Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*, pp. 27–54.
- , *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1993)
- , 'Multiculturalism and British Identity in the Wake of the Rushdie Affair', in Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*, pp. 239–268
- Aspden, Kester, *Nationality: Wog. The Hounding of David Oluwale* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007)
- Back, Les, 'At Home and Not at Home: Stuart Hall in Conversation with Les Back', *Cultural Studies*, 23 (2009), 658–687
- , *The Art of Listening* (Oxford: Berg, 2007)
- Back, Les, and John Solomos, eds., *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1999)
- Baldwin, James, 'Down at the Cross', in James Baldwin, *The Fire Next Time* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963, repr. 1973), pp. 19–89
- , 'The Harlem Ghetto', in Baldwin, *Notes of a Native Son*, pp. 47–60
- , 'Many Thousands Gone', in Baldwin, *Notes of a Native Son*, pp. 18–36
- , *Notes of a Native Son* (New York: Bantam, 1955, repr. 1964)
- , 'White Man's Guilt', *Ebony*, (August 1965)
- Banton, Michael, 'Social aspects of the race question', in UNESCO, *Four statements on the race question* (Paris, France: UNESCO, 1969), pp. 17–29
- Bardsley, Warren, *Becoming Human: An appreciation of the life and ministry of Geoffrey Ainger* (Self-Published: Church in the Marketplace Publications, 2014)
- Bent, Ans J. van der, ed., *Breaking Down the Walls: World Council of Churches Statements and Actions on Racism, 1948-1985* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1986)
- , 'Logs in Our Eyes: The Struggle of the Ecumenical Movement Against Racism', *The Ecumenical Review*, 32 (1980), 166–272
- , ed., *World Council of Churches' Statements and Actions on Racism, 1948-1979* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1980)
- Berlinerblau, Jacques, *The Secular Bible: Why Nonbelievers Must Take Religion Seriously* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Black, Lawrence, *Redefining British Politics: Culture, Consumerism and Participation, 1954-1970* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010)
- Blackman, Rick, 'Rock and Roll against racism', *Socialist Review*, 409 (2016), <<http://socialistreview.org.uk/409/rock-and-roll-against-racism>> [accessed 15 September 2016]
- Blundell, Valda, et. al., eds., *Relocating Cultural Studies: Developments in*

- theory and research* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Boer, Roland, 'EP Thompson and the psychic terror of Methodism', *Thesis Eleven*, 110 (2012), 54–67
- Booth, Charles, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (London: Macmillan, 1889)
- Bourke, Joanna, *Working-Class Cultures in Britain, 1890-1960: Gender, class and ethnicity* (London: Routledge, 1994)
- Bourne, Jenny, and Ambalavaner Sivanandan, 'Cheerleaders and Ombudsmen: The Sociology of Race Relations in Britain', *Race & Class*, XXI (1980), 331–352
- Bressey, Caroline, *Empire, Race and the Politics of Anti-Caste* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013)
- Brewitt-Taylor, Sam, "'Christian Radicalism" in the Church of England, 1957-70' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2012)
- , 'Christianity and The Invention of the Sexual Revolution in Britain, 1963–1967', *The Historical Journal*, FirstView Article (2016), 1–28
- , 'The Invention of a "Secular Society"? Christianity and the Sudden Appearance of Secularization Discourses in the British National Media, 1961–4', *Twentieth Century British History*, 24 (2013), 327–350
- British Council of Churches, *Your Neighbour from the West Indies* (London: British Council of Churches, 1958)
- Brown, Callum G., *The Death of Christian Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001)
- , *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2006)
- Bruce, Steve, *God is Dead: Secularization in the West* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003)
- , *Religion in Modern Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- Buber, Martin, *I and Thou*, trans. by Ronald Gregor Smith (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013)
- Bunce, Robin, and Paul Field, *Darcus Howe: A Political Biography* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014)
- , 'Obi B. Egbuna, C. L. R. James and the Birth of Black Power in Britain: Black Radicalism in Britain 1967-72', *Twentieth Century British History*, 22 (2010), 391–414
- Burgess, Edward, 'Letter on Returning from America', *Broadsheet of Christian Thought and Action*, 78 (September 1958), 15–16
- Burgess, Tyrrell, et. al., eds., *Matters of Principle: Labour's Last Chance* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
- Burkett, Jodi, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain: Britishness, 'Race' and the*

- Radical Left in the 1960s* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)
- Burton, Edson, 'From Assimilation to Anti-Racism: The Church of England's Response to Afro-Caribbean Migration, 1948-1981' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the West of England, 2004)
- Calley, Malcolm J.C., *God's People: West Indian Pentecostal Sects in England* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1965)
- Camara, Dom Helder, 'Violence and Misery', *New Blackfriars*, 50 (1969), 491–496
- Carby, Hazel V., 'Schooling in Babylon', in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back*, pp. 183–211
- Carmichael, Stokely, and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967, repr. 1969)
- Carson, Clayborne, *SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (London: Harvard University Press, 1981, repr. 1982)
- Carter, Bob, *et. al.*, 'The 1951-55 Conservative Government and the Racialization of Black Immigration', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 6 (1987), 335–347
- Carter, Trevor, with Jean Coussins, *Shattering Illusions: West Indians in British Politics* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1986)
- Casanova, José, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1994)
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and racism in 70s Britain* (London: Hutchinson, 1982, repr. 1983)
- Certeau, Michel de, *Culture in the Plural*, trans. by Tom Conley (London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997)
- , *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. by Steven Rendall (London: University of California Press, 1988).
- , 'Psychoanalysis and its History', in Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1989, repr. 2000), pp. 3–16
- , *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (Chichester: Columbia University Press, 1975, repr. 1988)
- Chapman, Alistair, 'Civil Religions in Derby, 1930-2000', *The Historical Journal*, 2016 (FirstView), 1–27
- Chessum, Lorna, 'Race and Immigration in the Leicester Local Press 1945-62', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 17 (1998), 36–56
- Clarke, Simon, and Steve Garner, *White Identities: A Critical Sociological Approach* (London: Pluto Press, 2010)
- Coard, Bernard, *How the West Indian Child is Made Educationally Subnormal*

- in the British School System: The Scandal of the Black Child in Schools in Britain* (London: New Beacon Books, 1971)
- Cohen, Abner, *Masquerade Politics: Explorations in the Structure of Urban Cultural Movements* (Oxford: Berg, 1993)
- Cohen, Stanley, *States of Denial: Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001, repr. 2006)
- Collins, Sydney, *Coloured Minorities in Britain: Studies in British Race Relations based on African, West Indian and Asiatic Immigrants* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957)
- Cox, Jeffrey, 'From the Empire of Christ to the Third World: Religion and the Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century', in Thompson, ed., *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 76–121
- Crockett, Alasdair, and David Voas, 'Generations of Decline: Religious Change in 20th-Century Britain', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45 (2006), 567–584
- Daniel, W.W., *Racial Discrimination in England: Based on the PEP Report* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
- Davie, Grace, *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994)
- Davies, Miranda, and Sarah Anderson with Annabel Hendry, *Inside Notting Hill* (London: Portobello Publishing, 2001)
- Davies, Rupert, *Methodism* (London: Epworth Press, 1963, repr. 1976)
- , 'Since 1932', in Rupert Davies, A. Raymond George, and Gordon Rupp, eds., *A History of The Methodist Church in Great Britain: Volume Three* (London: Epworth Press, 1983), pp. 362–390
- Davis, John, 'Containing Racism? The London Experience, 1957-1968', in Kelley, and Tuck, eds., *The Other Special Relationship*, pp. 125–146
- , 'Rents and Race in 1960s London: New Light on Rachmanism', *Twentieth Century British History*, 12 (2001), 69–92
- Deakin, Stephen, 'The churches: immigration and race relations', *New Community*, 12 (1984-85), 101–115
- Dean, D.W., 'Coping with Colonial Immigration, the Cold War and Colonial Policy: The Labour Government and Black Communities in Great Britain 1945-51', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 6 (1987), 305–334
- Denny, Norwyn, *Caring: The Pastoral Ministry of the Christian Community* (London: Epworth Press, 1976)
- , 'Learning to Care', in Waterhouse, ed., *Beware The Church*, pp. 48–66
- , 'New Life in Notting Hill', *The Kingdom Overseas*, April 1967, 14–20
- , 'The Notting Hill Team Ministry Experiment', *Contact: Publication of*

- Hanwell Methodist Church*, 136 (7 July 1963), 3–6
- Desai, Rashmi, *Indian Immigrants in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1963)
- DiAngelo, Robin, 'White Fragility', *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3 (2011), 54–70
- Dijk, Teun A. van, 'Denying Racism: Elite Discourse and Racism', in John Wrench, and John Solomos, eds., *Racism and Migration in Western Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 1993), pp. 179–193
- Donnelly, Lewis, ed., *Justice First* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1969)
- Downing, John, 'But That's History!', in Donnelly, ed., *Justice First*, pp. 10–24
- Du Bois, W.E.B., *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York, NY: Dover, 1903, repr. 1994)
- Duckworth, Brian, 'Mission and Evangelism', in Waterhouse, ed., *Beware The Church*, pp. 20–36
- Dummett, Ann, *A Portrait of English Racism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
- Dummett, Michael, and Ann Dummett, 'The Role of Government in Britain's Racial Crisis', in Donnelly, ed., *Justice First*, pp. 25–78
- Egbuna, Obi, *Destroy This Temple: The Voice of Black Power in Britain* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1971)
- Elton, Lord, *The Unarmed Invasion: A Survey of Afro-Asian Immigration* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1965)
- Fairclough, Adam, *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (London: University of Georgia Press, 1987)
- Featherstone, David, *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism* (London: Zed Books, 2012)
- Feldman, David, 'Why the English like Turbans: Multicultural Politics in British History', in David Feldman, and Jon Lawrence, eds., *Structures and Transformations in Modern British History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 281–302
- Fethney, John, 'Prejudice and Churchgoers', *Race Today*, 5 (1973), 10–12
- Fielding, Steven, 'Brotherhood and the Brothers: Responses to "coloured" Immigration in the British Labour Party C. 1951–1965', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 3 (1998), 79–97
- Fitzgerald, Thomas E., *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History* (London: Praeger, 2004)
- Fitzgerald, Timothy, *Discourse on Civility and Barbarity: A Critical History of Religion and Related Categories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

- , *The Ideology of Religious Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Foot, Paul, *Immigration and Race in British Politics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965)
- Frost, Brian, *Goodwill on Fire: Donald Soper's Life and Mission* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996)
- , *The Secular in the Sacred* (Great Yarmouth: Galliard, 1972)
- , 'A Small Cog in a Big Anti-Apartheid Wheel: Pauline Webb, David Haslam and End Loans to South Africa (ELTSA)', in Brian Frost, and Stuart Jordan, *Pioneers of Social Passion: London's Cosmopolitan Methodism* (Peterborough: Epworth, 2006), pp. 189–201
- , *The Tactics of Pressure: A Critical Review of Six British Pressure Groups* (London: Galliard, 1975)
- Fryer, Peter, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (London: Pluto, 1984)
- Garner, Steve, *Whiteness: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2007)
- Garnett, Jane, et. al., 'Introduction', in Jane Garnett, et. al., eds., *Redefining Christian Britain: post-1945 perspectives* (London: SCM Press, 2007), pp. 1–18
- Garnett, Jane, and Alana Harris, eds., *Rescripting Religion in the City: Migration and Religious Identity in the Modern Metropolis* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)
- Geertz, Clifford, 'Thick Description: Towards an Interpretive Theory of Culture', in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 3–30
- Gerloff, Roswith, et. al., *Partnership in Black and White* (London: Methodist Home Mission, 1977)
- Gill, Robin, *The Myth of the Empty Church* (London: SPCK, 1993)
- Gilroy, Paul, *After Empire: Melancholia or convivial culture?* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004, repr. 2006)
- , *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001)
- , 'Managing the 'underclass': a further note on the sociology of race relations in Britain', *Race & Class*, XXII (1980), 47–62
- , *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1987, repr. 2008)
- Glass, Ruth, *Newcomers: The West Indians in London* (London: Centre for Urban Studies and George Allen & Unwin, 1960)
- Gordon, Avery F., 'On "Lived Theory": An Interview with A. Sivanandan', *Race & Class*, 55 (2014), 1–7

- Goulbourne, Harry, *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Post-Imperial Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- , *Race Relations in Britain Since 1945* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)
- Green, S.J.D., *The Passing of Protestant England: Secularisation and Social Change, C. 1920-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Green, Shirley, *Rachman* (London: Joseph, 1979)
- Griffith, J.A.G., et. al., eds., *Coloured Immigrants in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1960)
- Grimley, Matthew, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism, 1962-2012', in Garnett, and Harris, eds., *Rescripting Religion in the City*, pp. 207–221
- 'The Habit of Violence', *Universities and Left Review*, 5 (1958), 4–5
- Hall, Catherine, et. al., *Legacies of British Slave-Ownership: Colonial Slavery and the Formation of Victorian Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
- Hall, Catherine, and Sonya O. Rose, eds., *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Hall, Stuart, 'Absolute Beginnings: Reflections on the Secondary Modern Generation', *Universities and Left Review*, 7 (1959), 17–25
- , 'Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation', *Framework*, 36 (1989), 68–82
- , 'Racism and Reaction', in *Five Views of Multi-Racial Britain: talks on race relations broadcast by BBC TV* (London: Commission for Racial Equality, 1978), pp. 23–35
- Hall, Stuart, et. al., *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, The State, and Law and Order* (London: Macmillan, 1978)
- Hansen, Randall, *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain: The Institutional Origins of a Multicultural Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Harman, Chris, *The Fire Last Time: 1968 and After* (London: Bookmarks, 1988)
- Haslemere Committee, The, *The Haslemere Declaration* (London: The Haslemere Committee, n.d. c. 1968)
- Hastings, Adrian, *A History of English Christianity: 1920-1990* (London: SCM Press, 1991)
- Heathorn, Stephen, 'E.P. Thompson, Methodism, and the "Culturalist" Approach to the Historical Study of Religion', *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, 10 (1998), 210–226
- Heineman, Jr, Benjamin W., *The Politics of the Powerless: A Study of the*

- Campaign Against Racial Discrimination* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1972)
- Hill, Clifford, *Black and White in Harmony: The Drama of West Indians in the Big City, From a London Minister's Notebook* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958)
- , *Black Churches: West Indian and African sects in Britain* (London: British Council of Churches, Community and Race Relations Unit, 1971)
- , 'From Church to Sect: West Indian Religious Sect Development in Britain', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 10 (1971), 114–123
- , 'Pentecostalist Growth – Result of Racism?', *Race Today*, 3 (1971), 187–190
- , *West Indian Migrants and the London Churches* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1963)
- Hill, Clifford S., and David Mathews, eds., *Race: A Christian Symposium* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1968)
- Hill, Michael J., and Ruth M. Issacharoff, *Community Action and Race Relations: A Study of Community Relations Committees in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1971)
- Hinton, James, *Nine wartime lives: Mass-Observation and the making of the modern self* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Hiro, Dilip, *Black British, White British: A History of Race Relations* (London: Grafton, 1971, repr. 1991)
- Hobsbawm, E.J., *Industry and Empire: From 1750 to the Present Day* (London: Penguin, 1968, repr. 1990)
- , 'Methodism and the Threat of Revolution in Britain', *History Today*, 7 (1957), 115–124
- Holmes, Chris, *The Other Notting Hill* (Studley: Brewin Books, 2005)
- Holmes, Colin, *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871-1971* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988, repr. 1994)
- , *A Tolerant Country? Immigrants, Refugees and Minorities in Britain* (London: Faber & Faber, 1991)
- hooks, bell, *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1992)
- House, Jim, and Andrew Thompson, 'Decolonisation, Space and Power: Immigration, Welfare and Housing in Britain and France, 1945-1974', in Andrew Thompson, ed., *Writing Imperial Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 240–267
- Howard, Vanessa, *A Report on Afro-Caribbean Christianity in Britain: Community Religions Research Papers* (Leeds: University of Leeds, 1987)

- Huddleston, Trevor, *Naught for Your Comfort* (London: William Collins / Fount, 1956, repr. 1987)
- Hughes, David R., 'The Biology of Race', in Hill, and Mathews, eds., *Race*, pp. 89–103
- Hughes, Robert, 'Immigrants and the Churches', *Alta: The University of Birmingham Review*, 4 (1967-1968), 216–223
- Jackson, Anita, *Catching Both Sides of the Wind: Conversations with Five Black Pastors* (London: British Council of Churches, 1985)
- Jaffe, J.A., 'The "Chiliasm of Despair" Reconsidered: Revivalism and Working-Class Agitation in County Durham', *Journal of British Studies*, 28 (1989), 23–42
- James, Winston, 'Migration, Racism and Identity: The Caribbean Experience in Britain', *New Left Review*, 193 (1992), 15–55
- Jarrett-Kerr, Martin, "'Here and Now" Books', in Wood, and Downing, *Vicious Circle*, pp. 5–6
- Jephcott, Pearl, *A Troubled Area: Notes on Notting Hill* (London: Faber & Faber, 1964)
- Jenkins, Robin, *The Production of Knowledge at the Institute of Race Relations* (London: Independent Labour Party, 1971)
- Jenkinson, Jacqueline, *Black 1919: Riots, Racism and Resistance in Imperial Britain* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009)
- John, Gus, 'The Black Experience of Britain', in British Council of Churches, *The New Black Presence in Britain: A Christian Scrutiny* (London: Community and Race Relations Unit of the British Council of Churches, 1976), pp. 11–17
- , 'The Churches and Race', *Race Today*, 2 (1970), 344–346
- Johnson, Mark, 'The Spirit still moves in the inner city: the churches and race', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 11 (1988), 366–373
- Johnson, W. Chris, 'Guerrilla Ganja Gun Girls: Policing Black Revolutionaries from Notting Hill to Laventille', *Gender & History*, 26 (2014), 661–787
- Jones, Claudia, 'The Caribbean Community in Britain', *Freedomways*, 4 (1964), 341–357
- Jones, Patrick D., *The Selma of the North: Civil Rights Insurgency in Milwaukee* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009)
- Karatani, Rieko, *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth and Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 2003)
- Kelley, Robin D.G., and Stephen Tuck, eds., *The Other Special Relationship: Race, Rights, and Riots in Britain and the United States* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015)
- Kenrick, Bruce, *Come Out the Wilderness* (London: Collins, 1963)

- King, Jr., Martin Luther, 'Emancipation – 1963', *Renewal*, 3 (June 1963), 2–3
- Kolsbun, Ken, with Mike Sweeney, *Peace: The Biography of a Symbol* (Enfield: National Geographic, 2008)
- Kunter, Katharina, 'Introduction', in Katharina Kunter, and Jens Holger Schjorring, eds., *Changing Relations Between Churches in Europe and Africa: The Internationalization of Christianity and Politics in the 20th Century* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008), pp. 3–7
- Kurlansky, Mark, *1968: The Year that Rocked the World* (London: Vintage, 2005)
- Kushner, Tony, *The Battle of Britishness: Migrant Journeys, 1685 to the Present* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012)
- , 'Racialization and "White European" Immigration to Britain', in Murji, and Solomos, eds., *Racialization*, pp. 207–225
- Lechtreck, Elaine Allen, '"We Are Demanding \$500 Million For Reparations": The Black Manifesto, Mainline Religious Denominations, and Black Economic Development', *The Journal of African American History*, 97 (2012), 39–71
- Leech, Kenneth, 'The Church and Immigration and Race Relations Policy', in Moyser, ed., *Church and Politics Today*, pp. 201–220
- , *Struggle in Babylon: Racism in the Cities and Churches of Britain* (London: Sheldon Press, 1988)
- Lent, Adam, *British Social Movements since 1945: Sex, Colour, Peace and Power* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001)
- Lewis, Gail, and Ann Phoenix, '"Race", "ethnicity" and identity', in Kath Woodward, ed., *questioning identity: gender, class, ethnicity* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 115–150
- Little, Kenneth L., *Negroes in Britain: A Study of Racial Relations in English Society* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1947)
- Machin, G.I.T., *Churches and Social Issues in Twentieth Century Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
- Macqueen, Ian, 'Students, Apartheid and the Ecumenical Movement in South Africa, 1960–1975', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 39 (2013), 447–463
- Malik, Kenan, *Strange Fruit: Why Both Sides Are Wrong in the Race Debate* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2008)
- Malik, Michael Abdul, *From Michael de Freitas to Michael X* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1968)
- Martin, David, *On Secularization: Towards a Revised General Theory* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005)
- Marwick, Arthur, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, C. 1958-1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

- Mason, David, ed., *News From Notting Hill: The Formation of a Group Ministry* (London: Epworth Press, 1967)
- Mason, Philip, 'Migration in a World Setting', in Hill, and Mathews, eds., *Race*, pp. 23–35
- Masuzawa, Tomoko, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005)
- Mathews, David, 'Introductory', in Hill, and Mathews, eds., *Race*, pp. 15–21
- Maxwell, Marina, 'Violence in the Toilets: The Experiences of a Black Teacher in Brent Schools', *Race Today*, 1 (1969), 136–139
- McCalla, Doreen, 'Black Churches and Voluntary Action: Their Social Engagement with the Wider Society', *Black Theology: An International Journal*, 3 (2005), 137–175
- McGrandle, Piers, *Trevor Huddleston: Turbulent Priest* (London: Continuum, 2004)
- MacInnes, Colin, *The Colin MacInnes Omnibus: His Three London Novels* (London: Allen & Busby, 1985)
- McKay, James, and Matthew Hilton, 'Introduction', in Nick Crowson, et. al., eds., *NGOs in Contemporary Britain: Non-State Actors in Society and Politics Since 1945* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 1–20
- McKeown, Adam, 'Global Migration 1846-1940', *Journal of World History*, 15 (2004), 155–189
- McLeod, Hugh, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Miles, Robert, 'The Riots of 1958: Notes on the Ideological Construction of "Race Relations" as a Political Issue in Britain', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 3 (1984), 252–275
- Mitchell, Basil, 'The Christian Conscience', in John McManners, ed., *The Oxford History of Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 618–643
- Modood, Tariq, '"Black", Racial Equality and Asian Identity', *New Community*, 14 (1988), 397–404
- , 'British Asian Muslims and the Rushdie Affair', *The Political Quarterly* (1992), 143–160
- , 'Political Blackness and British Asians', *Sociology*, 28 (1994), 859–876
- , *Still Not Easy Being British: Struggles for a Multicultural Citizenship* (Stoke on Trent: Trentham, 2010)
- Moore, Brian L., and Michele A. Johnson, *Neither Led Nor Driven: Contesting British Cultural Imperialism in Jamaica, 1865-1920* (Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press, 2004)

- Morrison, Lionel, 'Planning for Britain's Black Community', *Race Today*, 1 (1969), 245–247
- Moyn, Samuel, *Human Rights and the Uses of History* (London: Verso, 2014)
- Moyser, George, ed., *Church and Politics Today: Essays on the Role of the Church of England in Contemporary Politics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clarke, 1985)
- , 'The Church of England and Politics: Patterns and Trends', in Moyser, ed., *Church and Politics Today*, pp. 1–24
- Mulhall, Thomas A., *A Lasting Prophetic Legacy: Martin Luther King Jr., The World Council of Churches, and the Global Crusade Against Racism and War* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014)
- Murji, Karim, and John Solomos, eds., *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Myers, Kevin, and Ian Grosvenor, 'Exploring supplementary education: margins, theories and methods', *History of Education*, 40 (2011), 501–520
- Myrdal, Gunnar, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (London: Harper, 1944)
- Nishikawa, Mugiko, *Grassroots Media Zine, No. 2* (Urbana, IL: Champaign, 2014)
- Oldham, J.H., *Christianity and the Race Problem* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1924)
- Olden, Mark, *Murder in Notting Hill* (Alresford: Zero Books, 2011)
- O'Malley, Jan, *The Politics of Community Action: A Decade of Struggle in Notting Hill* (Nottingham: Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation for Spokesman Books, 1977)
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s, Second Edition* (London: Routledge, 1994)
- O'Sullivan, Kevin, 'The Search for Justice: NGOs in Britain and Ireland and the New International Economic Order, 1962-82', *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development*, 6 (2015), 173–187
- Paris, Peter J., et. al., *The History of the Riverside Church in the City of New York* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 2004)
- Parsons, Gerald, 'Introduction: Persistence, Pluralism and Perplexity', in Parsons, ed., *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Vol. 1*, pp. 5–21
- , ed., *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945. Vol. 1, Traditions* (London: Routledge / Open University, 1993)
- , ed., *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945. Vol.2, Issues* (London: Routledge / Open University, 1994)
- Pat McDonald Memorial Fund, The, *Pat McDonald: Working Class Heroine*

- (London: The Pat McDonald Memorial Fund Committee, 1989)
- Patterson, Sheila, *Dark Strangers: A Sociological Study of the Absorption of a Recent West Indian Migrant Group in Brixton, South London* (London: Tavistock, 1963)
- , *Immigration and Race Relations in Britain, 1960-1967* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1969)
- , 'Racial Images and Attitudes in Britain – The Background', in Hill, and Mathews, eds., *Race*, pp. 51–68
- Paul, Kathleen, 'From Subjects to Immigrants: Black Britons and National Identity, 1948-62', in Richard Weight and Abigail Beach, eds., *The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain, 1930-1960* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998), pp. 223–248
- , *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era* (London: Cornell University Press, 1997)
- Pearson, David, *Race, Class and Political Activism: A Study of West Indians in Britain* (Farnborough: Gower, 1981)
- Phillips, Charlie, and Mike Phillips, *Notting Hill in the Sixties* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1991)
- Phillips, Mike, and Trevor Phillips, *Windrush: The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain* (London: HarperCollins, 1998)
- Pilkington, Edward, *Beyond the Mother Country: West Indians and the Notting Hill White Riots* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1988)
- Porter, Andrew, 'Religion, Missionary Enthusiasm, and Empire', in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III, The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 222–246
- Prochaska, Frank, *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain: The Disinherited Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- Pryce, Everton A., 'The Notting Hill Gate Carnival – Black Politics, Resistance, and Leadership, 1976-1978', *Caribbean Quarterly*, 31 (1985), 35–52
- Ramamurthy, Anandi, *Black Star: Britain's Asian Youth Movements* (London: Pluto, 2013)
- , 'The Politics of Britain's Asian Youth Movements', *Race & Class*, 48 (2006), 38–60
- Ramdin, Ron, *The Making of the Black Working Class in Britain* (Aldershot: Wildwood, 1987)
- Rattansi, Ali, 'The Uses of Racialization: The Time-Spaces and Subject-Objects of the Raced Body', in Murji, and Solomos, eds., *Racialization*, pp. 271–301
- Reuver, Marc, *Christians as Peace Makers: Peace Movements in Europe and the USA* (Geneva: WCC Publications 1988)

- Rex, John, 'The Race Relations Catastrophe', in Burgess, *et. al.*, eds., *Matters of Principle*, pp. 70–83
- Rex, John, and Robert Moore, *Race, Community, and Conflict: A Study of Sparkbrook* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1967)
- Roberts, Eleanor, 'Daring to be Present: An Interview with Carlyle Reedy', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 25 (2015), 1–12
- Robinson, John A.T., 'The Gospel and Politics', in John A.T. Robinson, *On Being the Church in the World* (London: Mowbrays, 1960), pp. 133–139
- , *Honest to God* (London: SCM Press, 1963)
- Rose, E.J.B, *et. al.*, *Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1969)
- Rowe, Michael, *The Racialisation of Disorder in Twentieth Century Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998)
- Rowe, Trevor, 'Worship', in Waterhouse, ed., *Beware The Church*, pp. 37–47
- Rush, Anne Spry, *Bonds of Empire: West Indians and Britishness from Victoria to Decolonization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Rustin, Michael, 'Community Organising in England – Notting Hill Summer Project 1967', *Alta: The University of Birmingham Review*, 4 (1967–1968), 189–211
- Sanderson, Nuala, 'The Impact of the Struggle for Racial Equality in the United States on British Racialised Relations from 1958 to 1968' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton, 1999)
- Sansbury, Kenneth, *Combatting Racism: The British Churches and the WCC Programme to Combat Racism* (London: BCC, 1975, repr. 1978)
- Sawh, Roy, 'Black Power in Britain', Donnelly, ed., *Justice First*, pp. 123–139
- , *From Where I Stand* (London: Hansib, 1987)
- Schaffer, Gavin, 'Legislating against Hatred: Meaning and Motive in Section Six of the Race Relations Act of 1965', *Twentieth Century British History*, 25 (2014), 251–275
- Schofield, Camilla, *Enoch Powell and the Making of Postcolonial Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)
- Schwarz, Bill, *Memories of Empire, Volume I: The White Man's World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- , 'Not Even Past Yet', *History Workshop Journal*, 57 (2004), 101–115
- , 'Unspeakable Histories: Diasporic Lives in Old England', in Peter Osborne and Stella Sandford, eds., *Philosophies of Race and Ethnicity* (London: Continuum, 2002), pp. 81–96

- Screene, Lorraine, 'Archival Review: Donald Chesworth (1923–1991) Archives at Queen Mary, University of London', *Contemporary British History*, 24 (2010), 257–263
- Sherwood, Marika, *Claudia Jones: A Life in Exile* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1999)
- Sinason, Valerie, 'The Psycholinguistics of Discrimination', in Barry Richards, ed., *Crises of the Self: Further Essays on Psychoanalysis and Politics*, (London: Free Association Books, 1989), pp. 217–227
- Singh, Gurharpal, and Darshan Singh Tatla, *Sikhs in Britain: The Making of a Community* (London: Zed Books, 2006)
- Sivanandan, Ambalavaner, 'Anatomy of Racism: The British Variant', *Race Today*, 4 (1972), 223–225
- , *Coloured Immigrants in Britain: A Select Bibliography* (London: Institute of Race Relations, 1969)
- , *Communities of Resistance: Writings on Black Struggles for Socialism* (London: Verso, 1990)
- , *A Different Hunger: Writings on Black Resistance* (London: Pluto Press, 1982)
- , 'From Immigration Control to "Induced Repatriation"', in Sivanandan, *A Different Hunger*, pp. 131–140
- , 'From Resistance to Rebellion: Asian and Afro-Caribbean Struggles in Britain', in Sivanandan, *A Different Hunger*, pp. 3–54
- , 'Imperialism and Disorganic Development in the Silicon Age', in Sivanandan, *A Different Hunger*, pp. 143–161
- , 'The Liberation of the Black Intellectual', in Sivanandan, *A Different Hunger*, pp. 82–98
- , 'New Circuits of Imperialism', in Sivanandan, *Communities of Resistance*, pp. 169–195
- , 'Race and Resistance: The IRR Story', *Race & Class*, 50 (2008), 1–30
- , 'Race, Class and the State: The Black Experience in Britain', in Sivanandan, *A Different Hunger*, pp. 101–126
- , 'Race: The Revolutionary Experience', *Race Today*, 1 (1969), 108–109
- , 'RAT and the Degradation of Black Struggle', in Sivanandan, *Communities of Resistance*, pp. 77–122
- Skinner, Rob, *The Foundations of Anti-Apartheid: Liberal Humanitarians and Transnational Activists in Britain and the United States, c.1919-64* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)
- Smith, Evan, '1968 – Too Little and Too Late? The Communist Party and Race Relations in the Late 1960s', *Critique: Journal of Socialist Theory*, 36 (2008),

- Smith, Evan, and Marinella Marmo, 'Uncovering the "Virginity Testing" Controversy in the National Archives: The Intersectionality of Discrimination in British Immigration History', *Gender & History*, 23 (2011), 147–165
- Smith, Io and Wendy Green, *An Ebony Cross: Being a Black Christian in Britain Today* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1989)
- Smith, Jonathan Z., 'Religion, Religions, Religious', in Mark C. Taylor, ed., *Critical Terms for Religious Studies* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 269–284
- Solomos, John, *Race and Racism in Britain, 3rd Edition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003)
- Spearman, Diana, 'Enoch Powell's Postbag', *New Society*, 9 May 1968, 667–669
- Spencer, Ian R.G., *British Immigration Policy Since 1939: The Making of Multi-Racial Britain* (London: Routledge, 1997)
- Stafford-Clark, David, 'The Psychology of Prejudice', in Hill, and Mathews, eds., *Race*, pp. 67–88
- Stockwell, Sarah, "'Splendidly Leading the Way"? Archbishop Fisher and Decolonisation in British Colonial Africa', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36 (2008), 545–564
- Street, Joe, 'Malcolm X, Smethwick, and the Influence of the African American Freedom Struggle on British Race Relations in the 1960s', *Journal of Black Studies*, 38 (2008), 932–950
- Tajfel, Henri, and John L. Dawson, *Disappointed Guests: Essays by African, Asian and West Indian Students* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1965)
- Taylor, Charles, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989)
- Taylor, John V., *Black and White* (London: SCM Press, 1958, repr. 1964)
- Taylor, Richard, *Against the Bomb: The British Peace Movement, 1958-1965* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)
- Thomas, Pradip Ninan, 'Media Reportage of the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism: A study of how the British press reported on the grant given in 1978 by the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism to the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe' (unpublished master's dissertation, University of Leicester, 1983)
- Thomas, Terence, ed., *The British: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London: Routledge, 1988)
- Thompson, Andrew, ed., *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

- , *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005)
- Thompson, Andrew, and Meaghan Kowalsky, 'Social Life and Cultural Representation: Empire in the Public Imagination', in Thompson, ed., *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 251–297
- Thompson, E.P., *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963, repr. 1977)
- Thompson, Ian, 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: The Non-Problem of Race', *Pro Veritate*, 8 (15 August 1969), 9–10
- , 'The Problem of Power and the Problem of Guilt: II', *Pro Veritate*, 8 (15 September 1969), 4–6
- Thorpe, Andrew, *A History of the British Labour Party, Second Edition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001)
- Together in Britain: A Christian Handbook on Race Relations* (London: Church Assembly Board for Social Responsibility, 1960)
- Tomlinson, Jim, *The Politics of Decline: Understanding Post-war Britain* (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2001)
- , 'Thrice Denied: "Declinism" as a Recurrent Theme in British History in the Long Twentieth Century', *Twentieth Century British History*, 20 (2009), 227–251
- Tomlinson, Sally, 'The "Black Education" Movement', in Madeleine Arnot, ed., *Race and Gender: Equal Opportunities Policies in Education* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985, repr. 1988), pp. 65–77
- , *Race and education: policy and politics in Britain* (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Open University Press, 2008)
- Tripp, Sebastian, 'Das Programm zur Bekämpfung des Rassismus und die "Glokalisierung" der Kirchen', in Katharina Kunter and Annegreth Schilling, eds., *Globalisierung der Kirchen: Der Ökumenische Rat der Kirchen und die Entdeckung der Dritten Welt in den 1960er und 1970er Jahren* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), pp. 297–311
- Tuck, Stephen, *The Night Malcolm X Spoke at the Oxford Union* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press)
- Turner, John Munsey, *Modern Methodism in England: 1932-1998* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1998)
- Twine, France Winddance, *Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Maintenance of White Supremacy in Brazil* (London: Rutgers University Press, 1998)
- Vague, Tom, *London Psychogeography: Rachman Riots and Rillington Place* (London: Vague, 1988)
- Vincent, John, 'Good seed: Stony ground?', in Waterhouse, ed., *Beware The Church*, pp. 7–19

- , *The Race Race* (London: SCM Press, 1970)
- Virdee, Satnam, *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)
- Visram, Rozina, *Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History* (London: Pluto, 2002)
- Wallis, Roy, and Steve Bruce, 'Secularization: The Orthodox Model', in Steve Bruce, ed., *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 8–30
- Walvin, James, *Passage to Britain: Immigration in British History and Politics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984)
- Warmington, Paul, *Black British Intellectuals and Education: Multiculturalism's Hidden History* (London: Routledge, 2014)
- Waterhouse, John M., ed., *Beware The Church* (London: Epworth Press, 1968)
- Waters, Chris, "'Dark Strangers" in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963', *Journal of British Studies*, 36 (1997), 207–238
- Waters, Robert William, "'Britain is no longer white": James Baldwin as a Witness to Postcolonial Britain', *African American Review*, 46 (2013), 715–730
- , 'Imagining Britain through radical blackness: race, America and the end of empire' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Queen Mary University of London, 2014)
- Webb, Clive, 'Brotherhood, Betrayal, and Rivers of Blood: Southern Segregationists and British Race Relations', in Kelley, and Tuck, eds., *The Other Special Relationship*, pp. 225–241
- Webster, Wendy, 'The Empire Comes Home: Commonwealth Migration to Britain', in Thompson, ed., *Britain's Experience of Empire in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 122–160
- , *Englishness and Empire 1939-1965* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Welch, Jr., Claude E., 'Mobilizing Morality: The World Council of Churches and Its Program to Combat Racism, 1969-1994', *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23 (2001), 863–910
- Wemyss, Georgie, *The Invisible Empire: White Discourse, Tolerance and Belonging* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)
- Whetlor, Shaaron, *The Story of Notting Dale: From Potteries & Piggeries to Present Times* (London: Kensington and Chelsea Community History Group, 1998)
- Whipple, Amy, 'Revisiting the "Rivers of Blood" Controversy: Letters to Enoch Powell', *The Journal of British Studies*, 48 (2009), 717–735
- White, John, 'Rich Countries and Poor', in Burgess, et. al., eds., *Matters of Principle*, pp. 54–69

- Wickenden, James, *Colour in Britain* (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1958)
- Wild, Rosalind Eleanor, "'Black was the colour of our fight." Black Power in Britain, 1955-1976' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield, 2008)
- Williams, Eric, *Capitalism and Slavery* (London: University of North Carolina Press, 1944, repr. 1994)
- Williams, Raymond, *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (London: Fontana, 1976, repr. 1988)
- Winder, Robert, *Bloody Foreigners: The Story of Immigration to Britain* (London: Abacus, 2004, repr. 2008)
- Wolff, John, "'And there's another country...": religion, the state and British Identities', in Parsons, ed., *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Vol.2*, pp. 82–121
- Wood, Wilfred, and John Downing, *Vicious Circle* (London: SPCK, 1968)
- World Council of Churches, *Ecumenical Statements on Race Relations: Development of Ecumenical Thought on Race Relations, 1937-1964* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1965)
- World Council of Churches Secretariat on Racial and Ethnic Relations, *Race Relations in Ecumenical Perspective: The Churches Amid Growing Racial Tensions in Britain, No. 4* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1962)
- Wright, Richard, 'White Man, Listen!', in Richard Wright, *Black Power. Three Books from Exile: Black Power; The Colour Curtain; and White Man, Listen!* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2008), pp. 631–812
- Zinn, Howard, 'History as a Private Enterprise', in Zinn, *The Politics of History*, pp. 15–34
- , *The Politics of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970, repr. 1971)
- , 'What Is Radical History', in Zinn, *The Politics of History*, pp. 35–55